

557237

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. XLIII—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, 1913.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1913

Lutheran
X-DA

CONTENTS

I. SIGNIFICANT PARALLELS BETWEEN CHURCH HISTORY AND POLITICAL HISTORY IN THE UNITED STATES	471
BY PROFESSOR ABDEL BOSS WENTZ.	
II. IMPRACTICABLE IDEALS IN CHURCH UNITY.....	491
BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.	
III. LUTHERAN INSTITUTIONS IN THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG AND ITS ANNIVERSARY.....	516
BY ELSIE SINGMASTER LEWARS.	
IV. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF RELIGION.....	524
BY REV. PAUL HAROLD HEISEY, M.A.	
V. THOUGHTS ON SPINOZA AND HIS SYSTEM.....	534
BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.	
VI. THE CONFESIONAL PRINCIPLES OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH	544
BY J. C. JACOBY, D.D.	
VII. WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THE PHILOSOPHY OF RUDOLPH EUCKEN?.....	551
BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, PH.D.	
VIII. THE PAPACY SINCE 1870.....	563
BY REV. C. W. HEATHCOTE.	
IX. CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.....	586
I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.	
II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL BOSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.	
X. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.....	604

A System of Christian Evidence—The Identity of Christ—Christian Science So-called—Wheel-Chair Philosophy—Plain Thoughts on Faith and Life—The Life Efficient—The Men of the Gospels—How to Prepare Sermons and Gospel Addresses—Christology or the Doctrine of the Person of Christ—A One-Sided Autobiography—Pastorale Praxis, in der Ev. Luth. Freikirche Amerikas—Union with Christ—Conversion and Election.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1913.

ARTICLE I.

SIGNIFICANT PARALLELS BETWEEN CHURCH HISTORY AND POLITICAL HISTORY IN THE UNITED STATES.¹

BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ.

The smallest unit in political life is the individual citizen. The smallest unit in the life of the Christian Church is the individual Christian believer. But these smallest units rapidly combine into societies. Citizens are associated into political societies which we call States, and Christian believers organize into religious societies which we call Churches or denominations.

It might indeed appear at first thought that the religious denominations would have their proper political counterparts in the political parties that have been operative in history rather than in the States of the Union. But when we seek the component parts of the American nation which are to correspond to the different Christian denominations as the component parts of American Christianity, we shall find a far better answer in the States of the Union, or groups of States constituting "sections," than in political parties which rise, flourish and fall in rapid succession. The denominations with their groups of congregations

¹ Address delivered before The Lutheran Historical Academy at Springfield, Ohio, Dec. 4, 1912.

bear the same constituent relation to the Christian Church at large as the sections of our country with their groups of States bear to the nation at large. The political parties in their relation to secular history are not indeed without analogies in ecclesiastical history. For just as differences in party affiliation fling themselves far and wide over the entire country ignoring the bounds of commonwealths and making themselves felt in every State, so too in the religious life of the people the differences between high and low, or strict and liberal, or progressive and conservative, scorn the bounds of denominations and make themselves felt in every denomination of any considerable age or size. But the great political parties, however useful they may be as checks on one another, are yet by no means the constituent or component parts of the nation. They rapidly change their complexion and policies and with the change of times pass off the scene altogether. There have been times in our history when our country proceeded quite safely and serenely without any mutually opposing political parties at all. But we cannot conceive of the republic without the States, without sections and sectional interests. Likewise in the ecclesiastical sphere we cannot conceive of American Christianity without differences of denomination. We can imagine an adjustment of the differences between liberal and conservative and so forth, but we can not imagine American Christianity without its differences of denomination and denominational interest, i. e. without its differences of doctrinal system and its differences of Church polity. The political societies called States are therefore the proper counterparts of the religious societies called denominations.

The States and the Churches are the determining factors respectively in the political and in the ecclesiastical history of our country. Just as the variation in interest and action of the different States or sections of our country has determined the course of by far the largest part of our governmental history, so the variation in interest and action, the common approach or cold aloofness of the Churches has given complexion and color to American Christianity as a whole and has determined the general trend of its history. These two elements, the sections and the denominations, constitute the two factors with which we deal, and their similarity of historical function constitutes the parallel which we draw.

Let us trace through the varying events of the political history of our country the rise and decline of the *national spirit* (which opposes itself to sectional interests) together with the corresponding decline and rise of *sectionalism*. And let us represent this fluctuation of national spirit by a line that rises or falls as the national spirit grows or declines. Then let us turn to the Church history of our country and trace through the multiplicity of ecclesiastical facts and phenomena the rise and decline of devotion to *common Christianity* together with a corresponding decline and rise of *denominational* zeal. And let us represent this variation in united devotion to common Christianity by a line that rises and falls as the feeling of unity increases or diminishes. My thesis is that these two lines, the one in the sphere of politics, the other in the ecclesiastical sphere, will run quite parallel throughout our history as a people. I do not mean to be understood as associating these two sets of facts in the relation of cause and effect. Nor do I mean to pass judgment upon either of them. Certainly sectionalism in politics can have nothing whatever to do with sectarianism in religion. And we can very well be opposed to the growth of sectional feeling and sectional endeavor without for a moment reprobating the growth of the denominational consciousness. And vice versa. But these lines we draw here are simply interesting parallels between the two spheres, parallels that are yet not without their significance. Other lines might be drawn from the one sphere to the other showing how the forces operating in the two spheres of activity intersect each other and cross each other in very intricate relations. But parallel lines never meet though they may be reciprocally dependent upon each other or mutually dependent upon a third.

RISE OF THE SPIRIT OF NATIONALITY.

First let us look at the general direction of the two lines during the first four decades of the history of our republic, say from 1790 to 1830. Before that time, from the end of the Revolutionary War till near the end of the eighteenth century, there was nothing like a general trend or movement along either of the two lines upon which we have fixed our attention. Before the beginning of the nineteenth century events in both the political

and the ecclesiastical sphere may be likened to groups of unrelated points, which can hardly be construed into series, and through which lines might be drawn in any direction at all. Nationally it was a time of beginnings, and this applies to States and groups of States. Religiously it was a time of great indifference, and this applies also to denominational zeal and interest. But with the opening of the nineteenth century affairs take on a distinct move. Religious convictions have been aroused and prepared for action. Popular interest in government and politics has been awakened never again to sleep. And all the forces and issues which are mainly to determine the course of the history in both spheres of activity for more than a century to come, are already in existence and operation.

The first period which we have undertaken to review is marked politically by the *growth* of the spirit of nationality,—the centralization of power in the hands of the federal government and the consequent limitation of the powers of the States. The sentiment and principle of nationality requires that the people's thought break through the narrow limits of State lines and contemplate the broader and deeper questions that arise out of the life of the whole country. It does not require the people to be a unit on all the details of organization and the means of accomplishing specific ends, but it does require them to transfer a portion of their admiration and affection from the State and locality to the nation. It does require that the mass of citizens love the good of the whole more than the narrow interests of the locality and that they see the highest interests of the State and neighborhood in the highest good of the whole nation. This spirit was painfully born amidst the throes of the debates upon the Constitution and its ratification by the States. Very feeble at first and barely able to continue alive it gradually gains strength until in the period now before us it attains to full stature of health and vigor. The following are the facts.

The national elections of Representatives and Senators for the Federal Legislature, and the selection of Presidential electors, recurring at short intervals, served to direct the attention of the people periodically to questions of national interest. The people of the whole country were made to engage in the same acts at the same time and for common national ends. An unbroken succession of federal events unconsciously stimulated the sentiment

of nationality and common concern, broadening the ideas and sympathies of the people and drawing them away from the narrower and opposing interests of State and section. This unconscious growth of national affection is well illustrated by the effect of Washington's journey from Mt. Vernon to New York to be inaugurated. It was a continuous triumph and those who participated, those who witnessed, and those who read and heard about it, were thrilled with hope and pride over the auspicious beginnings of the national government.

Then, too, a whole series of legislative acts, embracing all the leading measures of the Washington and Adams administrations, called into life national agents and national functions and subordinated the interest of sections to those of nation. We can merely name these events. And first those relating to domestic affairs. There was the protective tariff that at Hamilton's instance was levied on imported goods. This was opposed by the purely agricultural States of the South on the ground that it gave undue encouragement to the manufacturing industries of the North, but the protective policy was adopted and served to increase the powers of the central government and gained support for the nationalistic view of the functions of government. Then, too, the federal payment at their face value of all debts incurred during the Revolutionary War, both foreign and domestic, and the assumption by the United States of the State debts, the levying of an excise on distilled liquors (and incidentally its enforced collection in Western Pennsylvania), and above all the chartering of a United States bank,—all of these features of Hamilton's grand financial system were conscious and extraordinary stretches of national authority which called into vigorous exercise the *implied* powers of the Constitution, gave concrete proof of the strength of the national government, and rode rough-shod over all petty interests of localities.

Moreover, our foreign relations in this period are at once an indication and a cause of the principle of nationality. Washington's famous Proclamation of Neutrality as between France and England was a second declaration of independence which bore a new prophecy of nationality and shook off forever the colonial habit of cringing dependence upon Europe. The popular rejection of the French minister Citizen Genet, the great indignation against England in 1793 and 1794, and the war fever

kindled against France by the X Y Z affair,—all looked in the same direction of strengthening the nation at the expense of her component parts or sections. So firmly established was the principle of nationality at the beginning of the nineteenth century that when the Federalists overleaped themselves and the reaction placed Jefferson in the presidential chair, that great Democrat, the firm advocate of strict construction, of State sovereignty, and of limited national powers, found himself forced by circumstances to make use of the very powers which he had opposed. The duties and opportunities which opened up before him made it necessary to centralize power, to stimulate the spirit of nationality, and to develop common sympathies over common objects. In 1803 he purchased the Louisiana Territory although he himself acknowledged that he had no constitutional power to do so. Of the immense influence of this event upon the spirit of nationality we can not stop here to speak. Suffice it to say that the democracy of Jefferson was almost completely nationalized.

Then the English aggressions from 1803 to 1812 helped to swell the current of nationality. Even in New England where a strong sympathy for Old England had served to cultivate a sort of sectionalism her chief statesmen were nevertheless all arrayed on the side of the national policy. The War of 1812 also greatly promoted the national spirit and when in 1817 Monroe was inaugurated as President the country was at the full tide of enthusiasm for nationality,—in this respect the high-water mark of the nineteenth century. The National Bank had been re-established with more than three times the capital and authority of Hamilton's bank. The tariff rates, which had been doubled in 1812 to provide war revenue, were even increased in 1816 for protective reasons. Confident pride in the growing West and the experience of the war led Congress to vote lavish donations of public money for internal improvements. Chief Justice Marshall in his famous decisions interpreting the Constitution consistently rendered verdicts in support of the national authority against that of the States. A truly national literature had just been begun in the establishment of Niles' Register and The North American Review and in the writings of such men as Bryant, Irving and Cooper. A striking rebuke was administered to the political grumblers assembled at Hartford. Sectionalism was

branded with a stigma and for years the fall of the Federalist party served as a text for exhortations to national unity. President Monroe's tour of the States and his cordial reception everywhere stamped the period as the "era of good feeling."

This was the culmination of the movement towards nationalization of interests and the obliteration of sections. And while this whole period even to the end of Jackson's administration may with propriety be called "the era of good feeling," with the spirit of nationality stronger than the interests of sections, yet from the beginning of Monroe's term to the end of Jackson's there is observable a slight but steady decline of the national consciousness. The zeal for internal improvements at national expense began to lag somewhat. The rapid growth of the West and Southwest had begun to undermine the national sentiment by bringing the sections slowly to realize that their interests were mutually conflicting. The manufacturing North, the cotton-raising South, the farming and wool-growing West, each was slowly developing self-consciousness. The merchant aristocracy of the East, the planter aristocracy of the South, and the pioneer community of the West, grew constantly more conscious of their own peculiar needs. The South began to protest against the protective tariff and the North demanded higher protection. The election of 1824 brought forward the "favorite sons" of the sections as candidates and the election was thrown into the House of Representatives. Still, despite these indications of germinating sectionalism, President Adams succeeded in maintaining throughout his administration until 1828 the policy of a strong national government controlling the interests of all parts of the country. And it was left to the administration of Jackson to raise the issue concerning slavery and thus to hurl the country headlong into a new and different period of its history.

RISE OF CHRISTIAN UNIONISM.

Before we take up this second period of political history let us retrace our steps and follow the line of development in ecclesiastical history, and we shall find that parallel to these well-known facts in the history of the government runs a set of facts in the history of Christianity during this first period. Religiously

also the period from 1790 to 1830 may fairly enough be called an "era of good feeling." It is marked everywhere by the growth of the spirit of co-operation and common devotion to common Christian tasks. And while this splendid philanthropy was often marked by a deplorable degree of confessional laxity and distinct losses to the denominational consciousness, yet it is a very decided improvement upon the religious indifference and the utter moral deterioration that was witnessed by the two rationalistic decades following the Revolutionary War.

The cause of this change is undoubtedly to be found in the evangelical movement and the wide-spread revivals that marked the beginning of the nineteenth century. The evangelical movement has its primary action in the sphere of the affections and its normal result is a clearer perception of the brotherhood of man and new zeal in the varied works of Christian love. So it was that the Christians of the early nineteenth century became keenly conscious of the importance of what they held in common as Christians, as contrasted with what they held severally as members of various denominations. Denominational interests occupied them less; Christian and catholic interests occupied them more. The following, briefly, are the facts.

In the opening year of the century (1801) the General Assembly of the Presbyterians entered into the famous "Plan of Union," a compact with the General Association of Congregationalists of Connecticut. By this agreement the difference in polity between these two Churches was almost forgotten and something like organic unity was achieved, in order that the new settlements of the westward movement might be saved from local schisms and might be able to present full strength against real foes. A few years later a new denomination was born with the distinct purpose of protesting against schism and sectarianism and with the avowed aim of bringing unity among the Christian Churches. They have since become a separate sect known as the Disciples of Christ. In the wide-spread revivals of those years the Methodists and Baptists worked hand in hand, though at other points they were thrown into sharp competition. And sometimes both Methodists and Baptists enjoyed the co-operation of the Presbyterians who differed from them both in matters which they all considered important. The Episcopal Church began to practice quite commonly the interchange of pulpits, and in other ways to

show herself in full sympathy with her fellow-Christians. Even the Roman Catholic Church was profoundly influenced by the spirit of devotion to common Christianity and manifested a startling disposition to obscure or obliterate some of the most characteristic features of her own system. Catholic Churches were occasionally used for Protestant worship. Catholic priests and bishops actually preached to Protestant congregations. Jesuits served as trustees of Protestant colleges. There was a tendency to use the English language exclusively in the Roman worship. Lay "trusteeism" was quite general before 1830. All of which indicates a friendly feeling on the part of the Catholics towards other Christians and a disposition to act with them as far as possible.

Members of all these Churches which we have mentioned except the Catholic began to associate themselves early in the century for various forms of Christian philanthropy. It was not a federation of Church bodies but only an organic union of individual Christians of the various Protestant denominations for the performance of the high offices of the Church universal. Such organizations were, first of all the American Bible Society (organized 1808), then the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (1810), the American Education Society (1813), the American Sunday School Union (1824), the American Tract Society (1825), the Seamen's Friend Society (1826), and the American Home Missionary Society (1826). These organizations were inter-denominational in their scope, and that so many of them date their birth from this period is striking evidence of the general tendency.

Our own Lutheran Church was no exception to this general trend among the Churches to obliterate historic traits and to cultivate closer relations with others. The German-American Church in its two branches, the Lutheran and the Reformed, had felt practically nothing of the Great Awakening of 1740, and now at the beginning of the nineteenth century they were somewhat slower than other Churches to feel the quickening evangelical influences which would lead them out of themselves. This was due in part no doubt to the obstacles interposed by the differences of language, but more largely to their intrinsic conservatism of doctrine and practice and to their longer period of training in the methods and responsibilities of established Churches.

But when at last the new American impulse did begin to act vigorously upon them, say after 1820, they joined in the evangelical movement with intense fervor and manifested great zeal in co-operating with their fellow-Christians in the works of Christian love. And not only so, but they manifested an unusual degree of confessional laxity and for several decades threatened to obliterate the historic traits which had marked them among Christians for almost three centuries. This belated movement continued in force long beyond 1830. It was stronger in the Lutheran Church than in the Reformed.

Already at the opening of the century sporadic evidences of weakening denominational consciousness are to be found among the Lutherans. In the revised Synodical Constitution of the Pennsylvania Ministerium all confessional tests were eliminated. There was no reference whatever to the symbols. The promises of the catechists included no mention of the Augsburg Confession. Among the rank and file of the congregations and their pastors there were not a few inconsistencies with sound Lutheran practice. Repeatedly pastors had to be admonished to return to Lutheran ways. Paul Henkel was warned to beware of camp-meetings. Dr. Helmuth's intimate relations with the Moravians was probably responsible for the fact that he inculcated into his pupils an aversion to explicit theological definitions. To suggest how far the indifferentism to distinctive Lutheranism had gone in the New York Ministerium we need but to mention the President Dr. Quitman and his rationalistic catechism. Corresponding to this was Dr. Velthusen's catechism published for the congregations in North Carolina. In New York under Dr. Kunze's leadership the tendency was towards unionism with the Episcopal Church. In North Carolina the Lutheran Synod fraternized closely with the Episcopal Church and both Episcopals and Moravians officiated regularly for Lutheran congregations. In rural Pennsylvania the churches as a rule were union churches (Lutheran and Reformed) and the congregations were union congregations. Lutherans and Reformeds co-operated in managing the affairs of Franklin College at Lancaster and they had no compunctions about permitting a Catholic priest to be included among the trustees. In 1817 appeared the "Gemeinschaftliches Gesangbuch" for Lutherans and Reformeds, and by 1818 active efforts

were afoot among these two Churches to establish a Joint Theological Seminary.

Then the organization of the General Synod in 1820 operated as a protest against these schemes for union and served to check in a measure the movement towards the obliteration of denominational distinctions. But the fact that our Lutheran leaders had been educated in the institutions of other denominations, the prevalence of revivalistic methods throughout the country, the generous strain of pietism that rang through all the American Lutheranism of the day, and the fact that our Lutheran educational institutions established during this period quite naturally showed the inevitable effect of the spirit of the times,—all these factors served to keep the denominational consciousness of our Church at a low ebb until long after the close of the period we are considering.

In general we may say that the period which saw in politics the obliteration of State powers and sectional interests and their absorption into the principle of nationality, witnessed also in religion the decline of the denominational spirit and the growth of devotion to common Christian tasks. Both Church and nation felt themselves called at the same period to grapple with the same problem,—that of securing harmonious co-operation on the part of a multitude of individuals, who were also members of various subordinate societies, organized for the attainment of kindred ends, but seeking them in different ways.

DOMINANCE OF SECTIONALISM.

The second period of history which now moves into our view covers like the first the round number of forty years and extends from about 1830 to 1870. It is marked politically by the growth and culmination of sectionalism in its conflict with nationality. We have already pointed out the gradual rise of the sectional consciousness because of conflicting sectional interests and habits. This conflict slowly grew into a struggle over the institution of slavery,—a struggle that was waged to the death. The roots of the contest go back far beyond 1830 to the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and even to the Constitutional Convention of 1787. But it was not until this period that sectionalism took slavery as its weapon and opposed itself consciously to the principle of na-

tionality, thus precipitating what may rightly be called the "era of hard feelings."

The facts here are so well known, even in their bearing upon this general topic, that we need not pause long to detail them. Their significance is plain. The Webster-Hayne debate of 1830 brings the issue squarely before the country. The ordinance of the South Carolina convention in 1832 annulling the federal tariff acts is the first effort at sectional resistance to the national principle. President Jackson's overthrow of the National Bank, and that too with the undoubted approval of the majority of American citizens, removes a strong support of the principle. Then the spirit of sectionalism expresses itself in terms of anti-slavery and pro-slavery and this momentous issue absorbs all other political questions until after the Civil War. Events move rapidly. The controversies over the annexation of Texas, over the admission of California and Kansas, the Congressional battle over the right of petition, the doctrine of nullification in the South together with the assertion of State sovereignty and threats of secession, the abolitionism of the North and the underground railway, the filibustering expeditions of the South,—these are the facts that manifest the line of deep cleavage between the sections. The economic and social interests of the South demanded slavery; the interests and feelings of the North endangered slavery. And with the actual secession of the Southern States and the appeal to arms on the part of the North, sectionalization was complete. This was not a revolt of the South against the nation. It was not a rebellion but a struggle between North and South over conflicting interests. Nor was this sectionalism healed immediately after the war. The South was treated like conquered territory. It was a long while before the "era of hard feelings" began to soften. A new nationality did not even *begin* to evolve until in 1870 the weapon that had been used to foster sectionalism and precipitate strife was permanently laid aside by the proclamation of universal manhood suffrage. Thus was completed by constitutional amendment the conflict of sectional interests in the old sense and the United States now began that career of unrivaled nationalism on which it might have entered in 1840 had not slavery blocked the way.

DOMINANCE OF SECTARIANISM.

Meanwhile what has been the trend in Church History? Again the line of movement runs parallel to that in politics. By the year 1830 the tendency towards unionism and co-operation among the Churches had run its natural course and in the period now before us it bears its natural fruit in divisions and subdivisions. The quickening evangelical impulse that had visited American Christianity at the beginning of the century was not lost but it was itself differentiated and diffused among the denominations which had enlisted in the common tasks of the Church catholic. For their co-operation soon revealed the fact that each of them had its own methods of doing Christian work. These methods were usually inherited from an honorable past and were associated with cherished memories of godly and heroic fathers. Each Church had a history. And as the members of each denomination entered with new energy on common Christian tasks, it became more and more plainly their duty and delight to do their work in the way in which it had been done by pious ancestors. For they naturally came to regard the men of by-gone generations as their superiors not only in their knowledge of Christian truth and in their zeal for Christian work but also in their devotion to proper ecclesiastical standards. They sought to serve the God of their fathers after the pattern given to their fathers. Loyalty to one's own Church once more came to be regarded as a virtue, and this virtue was emphasized even at the expense of the love for all Christian brethren. This brought about a new period in the history of American Christianity. The Churches began to recover their historical perspective. The lively and ever-increasing interest in the study of Church History during this second period is a striking phenomenon and it is highly significant. A study of bibliographies reveals the fact that during the thirty years preceding 1830 only forty works on Church History appeared, while in the thirty years following 1830 one hundred and fifty such works appeared. In the first period about five works are works of any importance, whereas in the second period fifty works may be regarded as of importance. It is remarkable too that denominational histories greatly outnumber the general works during this second period. This clearly indicates that in each denomination there was a vigorous develop-

ment of its own historic life. With the recovery of the historical sense each Church began to assert itself more actively and to be more keenly conscious of a special mission of its own. What had invigorated the American Church as a whole was now indirectly infusing new vigor into its several component parts. But this time the pendulum swung across to dogmatism in religion and ethics. Schism was almost regarded as a virtue and the result naturally was not only a parting of the ways, but often an angry parting of allies, internal discords, divisions, and strife. This period therefore is religiously a period of heated controversy and of unbrotherly strife, pre-eminently an "era of hard feelings" among the denominations.

In the first place there was a sharp differentiation and even warlike antagonism between Protestants and Catholics. American Catholicism was reverting to her true historical position and by 1854 trusteeism was eliminated entirely. But Protestantism as such had also awakened and had begun active war on her old enemy. Rome was fiercely denounced by tongue and pen. And it was not merely a battle of pulpits and pamphlets. But numerous acts of violence against Catholics were committed in various quarters. Monstrous slanders were circulated. The zeal of the anti-Romans was shown by the outrage upon the convent at Charlestown (Mass.), by acts of incendiarism at Charlestown and in New York, by the tar and feathers in Maine, by bloody riots in Philadelphia, and by bloodshed in Kentucky. The kindly disposition towards Rome during the earlier period has never returned.

Then too the Protestant Episcopal Church incurred the distrust and dislike of other Churches. With the year 1830 the High Church party began to predominate over the Low Church party thus strongly emphasizing the distinctive feature of this communion. In 1832 action was taken which excluded from Episcopal pulpits ministers who had not taken episcopal orders. Then came the Oxford movement within the Church, and accusations of Romanism from without, and the practical isolation of the Church from all co-operation with others.

Moreover the close federation of Presbyterians and Congregationalists in the famous "Plan of Union" was not permanently satisfying. And in this period came the split. The doctrinal conservatism of the Presbyterians and their difference in polity

from the Congregationalists led the Old School majority of the General Assembly in 1837 to abrogate the Plan of Union and to withdraw from co-operation with the Congregationalists in missions and in ministerial education. At the same time questions of orthodoxy and of Church polity led the Old School Presbyterians to cut off the New School Presbyterians who constituted four-ninths of the entire body. Each of these two bodies split again just before the War into North and South.

Both Methodists and Baptists began to assume sharply defined denominational attitudes and to withdraw from the unionistic benevolent societies into their own denominational organizations for benevolence. Then when the Methodists in the South found that slave-holders could not become bishops, and when Baptists in the South found that slave-holders would not be employed as missionaries, these two Churches also split into North and South.

In 1844 the German Reformed Church also began to rally from the effect of the evangelical movement and began to manifest the natural influence of that movement in the renewed energy of its own proper life as well as in its deepened spirituality and enlarged Christian activity. In the next ten years this Church became more conscious than ever before of her denominational character and mission. In this case the stimulus came from the so-called Mercersburg movement and its able leaders, Dr. Nevin and Dr. Schaff. The result was a long, fierce struggle within the Church, nearly ending in schism, and a bitter quarrel with her ecclesiastical twin-sister, the Dutch Reformed Church.

In our own Lutheran Church after her disastrous experience with evangelicalism the revival of denominational consciousness runs quite parallel to that in other Churches except that here again we are somewhat belated. By 1850, however, the return to historic Lutheranism was well under way. The Lutherans began to withdraw from co-operation with other Churches in benevolence. As early as 1841 Heyer had refused to go as a missionary under any but Lutheran auspices and henceforth there were Lutheran missions. In 1845 the Home Missionary Society of the General Synod was organized. Similar Lutheran organizations in other spheres of benevolence followed rapidly. In matters of doctrine also the day of indifferentism was over. Doctrinal hostility to the Synod of North Carolina and to the newly

formed General Synod had led the Henkels to form the Tennessee Synod. The Joint Synod of Ohio was unable on account of its conservative and strict confessional standpoint to form a union with the larger general bodies. In 1839 there arrived in Missouri a body of Saxon Lutherans imbued with a double portion of the spirit of confessionalism. Their fiery zeal for the whole body of Lutheran doctrine was made even more intense by the ardor of their piety and this union of zeal and fervor gave extraordinary power of propagandism, so that the few shiploads of Saxon pilgrims have grown into the largest of Lutheran bodies, the Synodical Conference. They have helped very materially to raise the general standard of confessional loyalty in this country. It was in that same year 1839 that a body of "Old Lutherans," separatists from the Prussian Union in Germany, came to this country and shortly thereafter formed the Buffalo Synod. These are some of the factors that contributed to and manifested the revival of the Lutheran consciousness during this period. In part it was the result of the new vigor imparted to all American Christianity by the religious movement earlier in the century; in part it was due to a revival of interest in the history of our Church; in part it was due to the importation of rigid confessionalists from Germany and Scandinavia. But this confessional reaction quite naturally led to internal controversies long-continued and acute, and in its conflict with the laxity of the former period led to further divisions of general bodies. In this respect the history of the Lutheran Church runs significantly parallel to that of other denominations and to that of American government. The era of disintegration in our Church corresponds to the era of sectionalization in the history of our country.

THE NEW NATIONALISM.

We turn now to the third period in the history of the republic, from 1870 to the present. Politically this period has witnessed the growth and establishment of what is widely termed the New Nationalism. This is far more than a mere return to the conditions of the first period, for it is not a trend in the direction of strengthening the federal government at the *expense* of the State governments. A new national consciousness has evolved since 1870 and has spread itself uniformly over *all* sections of the

Union. Beginning with that year 1870 the United States entered upon a career of phenomenal economic growth and this new economy has brought with it radical social changes. Among others, it has ushered in the age of specialists or experts and an unmistakable tendency towards specialized organization in American practical affairs. It has given us the business specialist or millionaire, the political specialist or boss, the labor specialist or union, and the government specialist or lawyer. The earlier homogeneity of American society has been seriously impaired and the mass of the people is falling into definite social groups. In other words, social and industrial problems are the real issues to-day and so far as our subject is concerned, nationality versus sectionalism, these new issues simply mean that the vertical lines of cleavage of the political mass into States have been blotted out and horizontal lines of cleavage into classes have taken their place.

To-day the States and the Federal Government and their respective rights and powers are clearly defined and these definitions are agreed to by all sections or rather by all parts of the country. The new nationalism does not have its home in any particular State or group of States. Less than a year ago practically the whole country united in calling to the White House a native of Virginia, a progressive representative of the new nationalism. The chief issue to-day is to meet the social and industrial problems. Whether this be done through the exercise of State or Federal powers seems to be a matter of little concern. But all do insist that in every part of our complicated social fabric there must be *either* national *or* State control, so that no neutral sphere may be left open to the predatory special interests. This is the new nationalism that defines the trend of the day.

As a matter of practice this tendency works in the direction of further centralization of power. This is due to the fact that our business operations have become nationalized and can be controlled only by the exercise of national powers. That this is the present trend many facts plainly indicate, as for example, the Interstate Commerce Commission conceived in 1873 and born in 1910, and the numerous moves in the direction of federal ownership and control of forest lands, mineral lands, swamp lands, water ways, water-power sites, and so forth. The federal

conservation of our national resources, the provision for an elastic currency by means of federal reserve banks under a federal board of control, and many other modern measures, all look in this same direction of strengthening the hands of the national authorities. Thus under the new star does the national power continue to grow without for a moment diminishing the functions and joys of the component States.

THE NEW DENOMINATIONALISM.

It remains but to indicate in a few strokes the parallel trend since 1870 in the ecclesiastical sphere. During the middle period in which American Christians were busy cultivating schisms and promoting strife among themselves they were also more or less diligently studying Church History. The history they were studying was chiefly such as would deepen the interest of the various denominations in their several inherited modes of thought and work but such as would also on the whole tend to weaken their sectarian prejudices. The different Churches summoned their members to a better knowledge of their own past and thus to stronger denominational attachments but also to a cessation of sectarian rivalry and strife. Each communion became more conscious of its own historic life but also more conscious of a mightier life common to them all and historic in a far grander sense than any of them. The study of Church History has always had a tendency to make permanent the variety of distinct religious societies. For in the perspective of the years the various Christian Churches simply represent various types of Christian life doing in different but not conflicting ways the work of the Church catholic. The desire for uniformity among the denominations in matters of belief or ritual or of administration has happily vanished but there is still an inextinguishable longing for something like intellectual toleration, for the laying aside of the ill-will and jealousies, for the cessation of the conscientious hostility that battled in the middle period. As in political life there has come to be a clear definition of rights and division of labor between State and federal powers, recognizing that the nation must command the supreme allegiance of all the citizens of all the States but at the same time insisting that the rights of the States be freely asserted and frankly admitted by the national

authority, so in religious life their supreme allegiance to Jesus Christ does not hinder the Churches from remaining true to their separate histories and cultivating their denominational consciousness, while yet arranging among themselves such a division of sphere and of labor as shall leave no territory unoccupied to become the camping ground of such special privilege as the world, the flesh, and the devil. This is the trend of the present day: toleration for all Christians together with a deepening of denominational life and interest.

As a matter of practice, this trend of affairs has operated not indeed towards Christian "federation" nor towards a "catholic basis" but towards the consolidation of the denominations each within itself. Many facts might be cited to illustrate this point, such as the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, the Methodist Ecumenical conferences, and recent movements among the Congregationalists, the Disciples, and others. Unionism is past; perhaps, too, in the present period sectarianism is passing and the dignified growth of tolerant denominationalism is becoming the order of the day. At the beginning of the nineteenth century Christians had fought against sectarianism. But they were mistaken in their methods and their results were not lasting. For they had degraded the evangelical movement into gross evangelicalism. By seeking to hide the manifold life of Christianity beneath the temporary cloak of evangelicalism they had threatened to turn the Church universal into one vast sect. The reaction could not fail to come. To-day again, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the protest is against any kind of narrow sectarianism. But to overcome the evil recourse is no longer had to artificial fusion and there is no tendency whatever to surrender distinctive tenets but a calm and frank recognition of a unity of motive in a diversity of method.

And finally in our own Lutheran Church, do not the lines of movement in this most recent period point in the same direction as the lines in the history of Government and the lines in the history of the other denominations? If so, then we have at one stroke the significance of all these parallels. Do not the signs of the times and most recent events among us indicate unmistakably the deepening of our Church consciousness and a decided increase in loyalty to historic Lutheranism, while at the same time they show a plain tendency to manifest a more tolerant attitude to-

wards all Christians everywhere and to recognize as brethren any who proclaim the unadulterated Gospel of Jesus Christ and the unaltered Pauline theology of justification by faith alone? The facts are fresh in our memories and need not be recounted in detail. The meeting together in Free Lutheran Diets and the General Conferences of Lutherans in America, the frequent utterances on the subject of Lutheran unity, the tendency towards a clear definition of territory and the division of labor in the missionary operations of the Church, in our educational activities and in applied Christianity, the co-operation in matters of service, the mutual approach in matters of confessional interpretation, the All-India Lutheran Conference with its prospect of a Union Theological Seminary in that country, the frequent conferences of Lutheran historians, of Lutheran educators of Lutheran students, and of Lutheran editors with the promise of the American Lutheran Survey,—all these facts and many others that might be cited indicate very clearly that beneath the barriers which separate the general bodies of Lutherans in this country there run deep currents of influence that act and react upon one another and operate steadily towards denominational consolidation. This does not mean a change in existing relations and affiliations among Lutherans. Denominational unity does not necessarily involve unity of organization but unity of faith. We have passed forever beyond the confessional laxity and the unionistic tendency of the early nineteenth century; but we have also passed forever, it is hoped, beyond the unbrotherly and unchristian intolerance of the middle period and we have entered upon a new era of cleared atmosphere and mutual understanding. Instead of the "American Lutheranism" of the early nineteenth century we have the "Pan-Lutheranism" of our own day, and this cannot but redound to the greater efficiency of American Christianity as a whole. In our Church, therefore, corresponding to the new nationalism in the government and the new denominationalism among the other religious bodies, we have a new sense of our Lutheran unity in faith and at the same time a new sense of our special mission as the Lutheran Church among the constituent parts of American Christianity.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE II.

IMPRACTICABLE IDEALS IN CHURCH UNITY.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.

Nothing should be alien to the interest of His people that is dear to the heart of their Lord, the Head of the Church and the Redeemer of mankind. It was in His great intercessory prayer that our Lord voiced His deepest desires for His disciples and for his Church organized and commissioned to administer the means of grace. It is evident from this prayer that He regards the oneness of His people, as most essential to His glory and the placing of the world in subjection to Him.

It is a source of humiliation and sorrow to all right-minded Christians that our churches are not making more rapid progress against the powers and evils of this world and setting up the kingdom of Christ in the hearts and lives of men with more rapidity. That something is the cause of this deplorable delinquency all acknowledge, but regarding what the real cause is there are various interpretations.

The great world of humanity is still largely unorganized and unsaved and this no doubt chiefly because the Church has been too restricted sometimes in her interpretation of her Lord's commission and too slow in performing her appointed task of bearing witness and making disciples. No doubt there have been times in her history when her schisms have dissipated much of her power bestowed through the gift of the Holy Spirit. There have been whole periods doubtless when she has been more occupied with the externalities of organization than with making known the great evangel of her Lord and Head.

In our day many good men believe that the tardiness of the coming of the kingdom of our Lord is due to this chief fact, that the Church is not presenting a united front against sin and darkness; that it is not a united body in Christ as is sometimes proclaimed and sung. It is claimed that Christian people have not fulfilled the great desire of their Lord and Saviour expressed in His prayer in the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. John, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also

that shall believe on me through thy word; that they may all be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

Instead of a union of all who have named the name of the Lord under one flag and set for one purpose, the conquest of the world, it is alleged that they are divided into scores of sects and creeds, each one apparently more engaged in the proclamation of its particular doctrines than in the Gospel of the divine crucified and risen Lord; each one more interested in the upbuilding and development of its own particular organization than in bringing the world into subjection to Christ and in the establishment of peace, justice and equity among the sons of men.

It is being urged that we should depart from the old, narrow, inefficient way in which the Church has been simply marking time, that we shall abandon our divisions, throw away our fears, clasp hands ecclesiastically and march forward to wider conquests in the assurance that "one is your master and all ye are brethren."

One of the most familiar things encountered in modern religious discussion is the emphasis laid by a class of Church leaders and writers that in the nation, community, Church and home, unity is strength and peace and prosperity, while division is discord, weakness and ruin. So anxious indeed are some good and devout people for Church oneness as contrasted with Christian oneness, that it seems to the writer that they are willing to give up too many things that the Church cannot well afford to lose out of its life. Much as we believe in and desire a larger unity of the Church of Christ, of that "congregation of the saints in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered," we must say in all Christian candor and fairness that we doubt the wisdom of some movements which contemplate this as an end. Some of them are plainly impracticable, if they would not in the end really result in serious disturbance to the uniting bodies, as a consequence of a colorless comprehensionism. Even in the Roman obedience, which in appearance only, presents an imposing spectacle of unity, there are differences between different parties almost as wide and deep as those which separate the most divergent sects of Protestantism. The supreme need is a larger recognition of the really important things about which all believers should rally and the real oneness already at-

tained. We do not advance the cause of unity among believers by an evasion of the difficulties involved, nor by any failure to recognize victories already won by the Church, nor by thinking that our Lord's prayer that all His people may be one will not be answered until Lutherans become Methodists and Presbyterians Episcopalian. When we come to consider organic unity, so much desired by many, it is well to contemplate certain things that render impracticable all schemes proposed to effect such a unity.

(1). We may say first of all that there is no prospect of any such unity on the basis of indifference to truth.

With what gives promise of hastening the real unity among the people of God, all good people should be in sympathetic relations. But they should be as pronouncedly unsympathetic with all constrained efforts at unification that propose in any way to minimize the truth. Along some of the lines contemplated for hastening such unity, we feel assured that no real unity is going to be found. It is a strange and dangerous delusion that has gained currency among some Protestants that this unity is going to be hastened by any sort of indifference to the truth. Such a basis of unification gives as much promise of being effective, as there is any quickening for faith in the literary assumption that we may maintain our faith in Christianity while losing confidence in the literary documents in which the facts of early Christian history are transmitted to us. Any organic union of the Church that is based on indifference to religion or upon a depreciation of honest convictions about such subjects as God, Christ, sin, redemption and grace is far worse than denominational isolation. That denominationalism that is based upon honestly formed convictions about the great things of the Gospel, the Church and its work, and which is approbriously called "sectarianism" by ardent advocates of an external unity of the Church, is not wholly bad. We are justified in sustaining an attitude of suspicion toward any so-called unity that rests upon the superficial assumption that one faith is as good as another, if you are only sincere about it and, as has been indicated by one sane writer on the subject, that you can promote a Heaven and Hell amalgamation society because of the fact that there is really no heaven and no hell. In our day of indifference to dogmas and creeds, of hostility to so much that is rooted not

only in the Word of God but also in the past history of the Church, there is nothing that the advocates of church unity may so wisely seek to be delivered from as the sort of unity which issues from an abandonment of all positive convictions about religion because of the specious and harmful notion that no religious convictions are worth anything, that all kinds of religious notions are equally worthy of credence, all are equally worthy or worthless providing they be held in sincerity. We contemplate the completion of an easy program and can get almost any sort of external unity, if the things that great bodies of Christians have apprehended the Gospel to teach and which they have confessed for centuries are not worth while contending for. Whatever betrayal of the truth there may be, however much a bland good, fellowship may seem to be a Christian unity in the true sense, certain we may be of this, that it is not the real thing, it is not the same as unity nor can it produce unity. A true union as has been said by one of our own sane and safe denominational writers "is not brought about by breaking common bread, or singing common hymns, or saying common prayers, or keeping common days, or wearing a common dress, but by holding to a common purpose and a common faith." To which we take the liberty of adding that both the common purpose and common faith must be adhered to in their integrity and without any indifference to what is apprehended as the truth of the Gospel. Unity upon such a basis is what Christendom should contemplate as one of its commanding needs. The cause of real concord among Christians is likely to be advanced when the Church sets itself to the task of manifesting this kind of unity instead of resorting, under the impulse of an impracticable sentimentality, to making it by means of the application of artificial and external methods. The real unity of the Church, in the last analysis of the matter, must rest upon something that man did not give and which man cannot entirely take away without serious peril to the body of Christ which is the Church.

When the Federal Council of the churches in this country was organized at New York in 1905, the writer was present and the organization then attempted, and upon the basis then and there set forth, seemed to give promise of much usefulness. But since that time much adverse criticism has been aroused, and chiefly as it seems, because of indubitable evidences of a regretful in-

difference to the truth as confessed by the evangelical churches. No doubt the difficulty and delicacy of defining for this council tangible and appropriate functions has become more and more apparent as experience in the organization has increased. The federation has encountered difficulty in finding something to do of obvious use, without duplicating the functions of the churches which created it. Its reports and circulars have awakened some grave questions. Claiming to be a method of co-operation among the different denominations, the council has become something more. It has become an organization of a series of organizations, which, as is alleged, may go far to supplant the organizations for doing the work of the Church, and to draw away strength from them. These various organizations have their various local, county, state and national divisions, each having its corps of officers. It is this multiplication of agencies, and crossing of purposes with the plans and work of the Church, that moved the *Presbyterian*, one of the ablest denominational journals of the country, to say a few months ago, in one of its issues:

"One difference between denominationalism and organized interdenominationalism is that the latter does the talking, and the former does the work. The former is much concerned with the Gospel, and the latter with sociology. The latter seeks reform, the former regeneration. The latter looks for popular success, the former for divine truth and fidelity thereto. If interdenominationalism succeeds, it will supplant the Church, and thereby prove a snare and a delusion."

The council seems to have fallen into the business of creating federal commissions on social service, evangelism, missions, education and more, when the denominations have their own agencies doing such work—boards, committees and expert secretaries—and when in addition these denominational forces are already working in a commendable harmony. In fact this has gone so far that the council has been charged with a departure from its original and single note of aspiration which was the unification of the churches along lines of practical co-operation and assertion of influence.

But all this has not aroused so much criticism of the Federal Council as has the drift toward an attitude of indifference toward a stiff and unambiguous evangelical faith. There are many who have observed with apprehension this drift from an adherence to

the old paths and the established ways. As an example of this drift it has been noted and widely commented upon that the commission of the council on theological education is composed largely of men of pronounced so-called liberal views, so that on this important subject its work seems to be that of a liberal propaganda.

We have noted with regret that in his address on assuming the presidency of this council of the churches, to which he was elected at the meeting of a few months ago at Chicago, Dean Matthews of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, gave a display of what strikes one as an example of this indifference to the truth. His address was able, as the Dean is an able and an interesting man. His declaration that the history of Christendom would have been different, if the first of the churches' ecumenical councils, that held at Nicea in A. D 325, had been interested in evangelism rather than creed building.

Certainly this was a cheap kind of talk, from an able man who is a scholar of distinction and who should know better than to indulge in any such ill-grounded generalization. It may serve as a watchword for the organization of which the Dean is the head, but as an expression of judgment it is narrow and specious and unworthy of the serious minded Christianity of our day. It would place a stigma upon all work that is not immediately practical and upon all investigation of the truth for truth's sake. Such reflections as this of the Dean of the Divinity School of the big Chicago university gives encouragement to the groundless theory that everything like ordered thinking in religion is a foe to the activity of the Church, that anything like an ordered and unambiguous statement of the Church's faith, as for example the Nicene Creed, means something of an abatement of zeal in Christian propaganda. Theology and a statement of theology in lucid form is an absolute intellectual necessity and such remarks as that indulged in by the able Dean give some sanction to those forms of modern cant which he himself at other times has mercilessly exposed.

This provides us with an example of how that present day latitudinarianism may pervert the vision of an able and highly educated man. Agrippa's challenge to Paul was not altogether idle, for much learning may sometimes indicate something at least of historical obliquity. But men who look upon the reli-

gion of Christ as a fixed and unalterable revelation from God to man instead of a dubious spiritual evolution in which by a continuous upward movement man is seeking God, will not be deluded. They are not going to suffer themselves to be planted upon any such basis of religious indifferentism, but are going to persist in insisting upon some definite beliefs for such a basis as may be practicable, and are likely to go on in antagonism to any kind of specious unconcern about the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

It may be said, too, in all fairness that the historical event to which Dean Matthews refers is not one wisely selected. It is a singularly unfortunate one with which to point his liberal reflection. The issues before the Nicene Council were of such primary importance and so far-reaching in their importance that we are surprised at the reflection of a scholar that carries with it the suggestion that the bishops assembled at Nicea in 325, would have done better service for the cause of their Lord and the world had they addressed themselves to practical work rather than to formulating the precise and unambiguous definitions of one of the Church's ecumenical creeds and one of the world's most lucid expressions in literary form. The consequences depending upon a credal declaration at that time were enormous. If the Nicene Creed is wrong, as wrong as many critics assume, then Christ is only what Wendt, for example, makes him to be, a great teacher and exemplar, then the Church of God is nothing more than a venerable society of ethical culture.

Speaking of that Council of the Church, one who was not very sympathetic with orthodoxy has said: "One need not be an orthodox trinitarian to see that if Arianism had had its way, the theology of Christianity would have become of a kind in which no philosopher who had outgrown the demonism of ancient systems could for a moment acquiesce." Thomas Carlyle was something of an interpreter of the factors that have entered into the making of human history. But Dean Matthews has evidently forgotten Carlyle's reversal of himself about the great importance of the issues confronting the Nicene Council. In his younger manhood he had been accustomed to speak facetiously and even contemptuously of the Athanasian controversy; of the Christian world becoming aroused and rent asunder over a diphthong and he would ring the changes on the Homoousion and the Homoiousion. But

when Carlyle was an older and wiser man he said that he had changed his mind after deeper and wider study of the subject and had come to see that Christianity itself was at stake in the distinctions involved in that controversy which the Chicago University dean thinks was something to be deplored in the history of the early Church. "If," said Carlyle, "the Arians had won, Christianity would have dwindled away into a legend. Vast consequences depended upon the refusal of a council of the Church in that early period to admit into Christianity the conception of the demi-god instead of a definite and unambiguous declaration that our Lord was very God of very God."

It after all made much difference for the subsequent history of Christendom that the Bishops of Nice were a little more concerned at that particular time about creed building than "evangelism," whatever the dean may have meant by that word. If Jesus is "the word of life" it is vastly important that we are not indifferent as to who and what he was and is. We are confronted not only with the fact of Christ but much involved in every way in the meaning of Christ.

The way to the contemplated unification of the Church is not going to be permanently advanced by any kind of indifference to the truth as it is in Christ. Such language as that used by the president of the Federal Council is not going to prove to be very inviting to many evangelical Christians. While these words are being written there is a sound of rejoicing on the air of the winter night, for it is Christmas eve. Human hearts are responding, as at no other time of the year, to the angels' song of peace, good will to men. As we look back to that lowly stable at Bethlehem of Judea, in which the years of the Incarnation of the Son of man began men want to hear the rugged voice of truth about who and what the Son of God really was and is. We say once more the way to hasten the unity of the Church is not going to be found in any proclamations of indifference to the truth.

In consequence of such indifference to fundamental truth the cause of Christian unity suffers from the comprehension forced upon it by some of its advocates. Of this we may feel assured that there will be no union based upon an interpretation of the Lord's prayer for "those who believe" on Him that "they all may be one" which is made the promise of an argument for union with such as do not believe on the Lord from heaven in any

scriptural sense. Unity without loyalty to Christ and careful definition of who and what Christ is, and what relation He sustains to our salvation and the world's redemption, is not Christian unity in any sense. Any basis that is practicable for this kind of solidarity must be Christian as well as unity. That comprehensiveness which denies the inspiration of the scriptures and which is indifferent about the doctrines of the supernatural birth of our Savior, the efficacy of his atonement for us on the cross, and the reality of His resurrection from the dead is not Christian unity but disloyalty to God.

There is a command which says, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." It is of wider application than that which is given it when used at the marriage altar. That command follows a declaration that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" and has "committed to us the word of reconciliation," that we "are workers together" with God and must approve and serve "by purity," "by the word of truth," "by love unfeigned," "by kindness," "by righteousness," "by the power of God," "by the Holy Ghost." This leads up to the command "Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers." This in the plainest language forbids comprehension in the modern sense of the term, "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness, and what concourse hath Christ with Belial, and what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?"

It was considerations which were based upon some of these aspects of indifference to truth that moved the *Christian Observer* to say in a recent issue, "There are other voices than those of evangelical men calling for union. Some have assumed to be leaders in the movement who disregard truth vital to evangelical Christianity. They are hostile or indifferent to the historic faith. They are actively propagating within the evangelical churches a new theology.

"They are fostering, if not forcing upon the existing churches, a new division. Their repudiation of the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures, their virtual denial of the deity of our Lord, their impeachment of the trustworthiness of the records of His birth and the testimony of His resurrection, their contemptuous rejection of the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, their radical destruction of the whole scheme of Biblical doctrine as well as of Biblical history, are a challenge to the loyal element

in the Church of God which must be answered soon and with emphasis."

The churches are coming to realize that, while interdenominational tranquility and unity and activity are desirable and important, the faith of the church is also to be preserved in its integrity, and that there is no permanent ground of hope for ecclesiastical unification in indifference to the truth as it is in Christ.

It has many times been alleged that good men usually agree when they confer about their duties to their neighbor, and the question promptly follows, what is it that separates them when they come to the question of their relations to God and their duties towards God? The question is often dismissed with repeating amiable commonplaces about "agreeing to differ." The weak point about this process is the temptation which it offers to treat the things about which men differ in all sincerity and on the greatest of all subjects as of no real consequence. No doubt this offers a convenient avenue of escape. But this kind of agreement does not promise much for real Christian unity. It encourages a temper that dismisses religion as the one subject about which there is nothing certain to be known and nothing definite to be asserted. It is only a reproduction of Tennyson's fallacy—

"We have but faith, we cannot know,
For knowledge is of things we see."

which is in marked contrast with the triumphant note of St. Paul, "I know whom I have believed." The road to unity among Christians it is manifest, does not lie through indifference.

2. It may be affirmed again that many of the proposed schemes for the unification of the Church, are constantly encountering the worked-out results of one of the living principles of the Reformation, the right of private judgment.

The variety of religious organizations in Protestantism is largely the outgrowth of the exercise of that right. In its exercise men have apprehended some things in the Gospel differently, as for example, what constitutes the Church and what is a valid ministry for the leadership of the Church.

That idealism which contemplates the existence of one great ecclesiastical organism in which all men are at intellectual agree-

ment may be inspiring enough. But so long as the right of private judgment is accorded men it will remain ideal only.

The essential differences between men, in power, in intellect, in influence and position are bound to find their analogy in religious interpretation, methods of work, expression of life and organization. We may not have as much of militant denominationalism as in the older days but there are still diversities of administration. The external unity of the Church contemplated in some of the plans proposed and extensively advocated in our day, candor compels one to say run counter in so many ways, to the fruits of private thinking and judgment that they seem to be prophetic of but meagre results in the end they seek to effect. They are so remote from actual facts and conditions that they do not inspire the confidence necessary to make them fruitful in any large way.

Organic union on the basis of some of the plans proposed would mean one of two things, the suppression of that conviction which is the result of the Protestant right of private judgment, or the perpetuation of internal contention.

If Churches with their historical differences and convictions should come together on a basis of the less important things of mere organization, then these differences and convictions must necessarily be suppressed or contention will continue. The suppression of conviction means spiritual and ethical sterility and contention means dissolution.

Even the psychologists in their multitudinous interpretations of things in the heavens above and the earth beneath have found a basis for the organized diversities in Protestantism. One of them has recently published a book on the subject of "The psychology of Religious Sects." One of the ablest books yet produced on the "Psychology of Religion" is that of Dr. George Cutten entitled "The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity." In one of the chapters of his able and interesting work Prof. Cutten discusses the matter of denominationalism and it is interesting to note what he has to say on the subject from his standpoint as a psychologist.

"The trees in the oak grove," he says, "the nestlings in the robin's brood, the cattle upon the thousand hills, and the children around the family table indicate very clearly that individuals of the same species are very much alike and yet quite dif-

ferent. Not only the bodies but the minds of men show these two characteristics. These striking similarities and concomitant divergencies are the marvel of God's universe. To the former fact is due the possibility of a common verse. To the latter, the necessity of different denominations.... The dream of the idealist, that denominations at some time will be a memory of the past, is a will-o'-the-whisp. It recedes as one advances, and at the moment you catch it, behold it is lost. Supposing the possibility of one Church, what conditions would exist? It would be but a name and no more a reality than at present. Birds of a feather would continue to flock together, and the real conditions would not be changed. Why not have one Church? Are the perversity and stubbornness of mankind to blame? Not that, men are psychologically constituted so that different things appeal to different persons, and religiously these things are represented by different denominations. Cannot men be sufficiently loyal to Jesus Christ to give up their petty differences? They are so loyal to Jesus that they will not surrender what to them is truth. Are the citizens of this country less patriotic because they are divided into numerous political parties? They express their patriotism by espousing those principles, the adoption of which they believe, would assist in the country's prosperity. Denominations are a necessity and will continue to be, so long as men's minds operate as they do now. And these differences show God's handiwork as plainly as the planets in the heavens which shine with different brilliancy, travel in different orbits, and attract different satellites."

This capable student of his subject does not think that all denominations are necessary or justifiable, but the principle grows out of the normal human constitution and will abide. Denominations which are based upon something that needs to be confessed and emphasized in its fulness are not necessarily antagonistic but they may be complementary. They are but different bands in the rainbow of Christianity that keep separate and are doubtless yet to blend under the leadership of the Head of the Church into one splendid arch of light and glory.

We cannot agree with much that he has written, but the famous Boston preacher, the Rev. Dr. George A. Gordon, is a man of unusual ability and equally frank and candid in the expression of his opinions. Recognized as a liberal in theology and as a man

of broad vision and wide sympathies, Dr. Gordon might be expected to pronounce emphatically in favor of the organic union of Protestant Christendom. But such indeed is not the consummation even desired by this modern prophet. He asks, "Is such a union on the whole desirable," and the answer given is an emphatic "I think not." He says:

"The legitimate differences of human beings are many and the denominational differences match the constitutional differences, and if we did not have the ecclesiastical promoter who overdoes denominationalism I think we should see at once that the Christian Church is not poorer but richer and more powerful, because of these different denominations. Efficiency and latent power are developed in different ways among different sets of human beings. Put a Congregational minister to lead a Methodist brigade or a Baptist to be the commander of a Presbyterian battalion and you will discover at once what I mean. There is a vast variety in this humanity of ours, and these denominations have naturally arisen to give effective expression to the divinely implanted variety in our humanity. Wiser administration of the denominations, a more statesmanlike ecclesiasticism will do away with many of the evils that now embarrass us as distinct denominations. Much of our waste would be at once eliminated if we had wise and noble men as leaders with a vision beyond organized Christianity in the interest of which organized Christianity is moving; men of this type would deliver us from most of the evils that are driving serious men and women to think of the impracticable—a united Protestant Christianity."

Dr. Gordon further appeals to history as furnishing a distinct warning against any contemplated plan of bringing all Christians into one organization. "Freedom," says he, "is a possession always in peril" and continues, "The Church was united once, the holy Catholic Church throughout the world, and what was it? An ineffable tyrant, denying freedom over its whole broad domain and crushing the intellect and the spirit into a dead uniformity..... Your one holy Catholic Protestant American Church would give me much uneasiness if it should come into existence to-morrow." The conclusion, then, is that: "There is something immeasurably better than a uniform ecclesiasticism. The vision of all men the children of God, all human beings the

possible disciples of the Lord, the vision out and beyond all organized Christianity of a redeemed humanity.

"Let us make over the problem of a split and vexed Protestant world to the great Captain of our salvation; let us fight each in our own regiment under his guidance, with good will and good wishes to all the others."

He argues further on the ground of differences in human disposition, temperament and training, maintaining that the various denominations provide for these differences. He declares that it would be unwise to "put a Congregational minister to lead a Methodist brigade or a Baptist to be the commander of a Presbyterian battalion." Dr. Gordon's treatment of the subject of temperamental peculiarities is amusing, but it contains sound reasoning and truth. He says: "There is too, incidentally, the subject of the crank; the peculiarity of the crank is this, that the man who is a crank in your communion, when he gets into another often becomes sane. You bottle up in your communion an inevitable Methodist, an inevitable Baptist, an inevitable Episcopalian, and see what a time you will have. The denominations are the clearing-houses for the cranks. I have seen many of them in my time, and I have thanked God when they found another church home."

There are others no doubt who have shared in the pleasure of the particular kind of emancipation noted by Dr. G. in this concluding sentence.

In his discussion of "The New Freedom" our able and honored President, Woodrow Wilson, has been advocating good scriptural doctrine in his advocacy of the individual soul over the industrial and social environment in which it finds itself and even over the "people" estimated in a body. Even the old world was never able to produce from itself the kind of external Christian universalism contemplated in some of these modern plans for the unification of the Church. The result of that great process of communion which was wrought out in the great Roman Empire was only uniformity and not true unity. True unity presupposes diversity. It is a comprehension of the manifold under a higher principle of organization. Outward unity of itself will never create unity of life. We close this section of our discussion with a sentence from one of our own writers, Dr. T. E. Schmauk, "The freedom of the soul in its individual conviction

of faith, and in its right to follow the dictates of its own conscience is far more priceless in worth than any power and unity in administration that arises from the possibility of universal cumulative action through an external unification of ecclesiastical systems and forces."

3.- But to pass to the consideration of another phase of the subject it may be confidently affirmed that the impracticability of some of the schemes for the unification of the church is clearly manifest in the attitude of the two communions, which are its most persistent advocates. These two bodies are the "Disciples of Christ" and the Episcopalians. The "Disciples" completed the first hundred years of their history as a distinct religious movement in 1909, but four years ago. Their rise in 1809 was marked by a schismatic movement to begin with, the withdrawal of Thomas Campbell from the Seceder Presbyterian Church in western Pennsylvania and the publication of what is known as the "Declaration and Address." It would be well to glance for a moment at the task of this people and their position, in relation to other bodies, as set forth by one of their own writers in the "Christian Union Quarterly" for July 1913. They say among other things that:

"1. From the first, their persistent concern has been the elimination of the evils of denominationalism and the advancement of Christian unity.

2. To this end they have repudiated the authority of all extra-biblical formulae as confessions of faith and rules of action in religion, and look to the teachings of Jesus and the ideals of the apostolic Church as their pattern.

3. Following what they deem approved apostolic precedent a candidate for membership is required to give favorable answer to but one question as an article of faith: "Do you believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God, and do you accept him as your personal Saviour?" or a question of similar purport. The divinity and Christhood of Jesus is thus made the central truth of the Christian system.

4. They have sought to discover the terms of pardon as promulgated by the apostles and to require no more than these for admission to Church membership.

5. Their study of the records of the early Church and their desire for unity have led them to omit the practice of infant bap-

tism as unnecessary and divisive. Baptism is administered only to those who have made confession of faith.

6. The example of Jesus and the early Church together with a desire to discover that which is most generally accepted as valid among all Christian bodies has caused them to persist in the practice of immersion only as baptism."

In a recently published book entitled "The Message of the Disciples of Christ," by Rev. Peter Ainslie, it is said that "The message of the Disciples has nothing to do with theology so far as making that theology or any other a test of fellowship. Its message is practical rather than doctrinal. It looks out from under the prayer of Jesus for the conquest of the world for Christ."

According to Mr. Ainslie, who speaks presumably for his communion, all who call themselves Christians are wanted to be in one Church. They are not to be federated simply and working harmoniously as detachments of the same great army of faith and righteousness, but absolutely unified, under one head or headless as the case may be. What is wanted is not churches but a Church. It is made to appear, at least to the satisfaction of the people who are its advocates, that it is both desirable and feasible, that the "Disciples" are the people to whom all the rest of the Christian world must unite themselves if they would be more successful in winning the world to Christ.

We are constrained to think, from what we have noted in the current discussions of the subject, that the historic churches of Protestantism are not taking very seriously the program of the Disciples, that they are not strongly attracted by placing the emphasis on that which is "practical" rather than "doctrinal." This reversal of estimates is not fascinating to people whose religious antecedents go back to the stormy days when their fathers were obliged to contend for their beliefs rather than for the less fundamental things of organization and administration. Mr. Ainslie further says that, "We (i. e. the Disciples) are at home in assemblies of Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Lutherans and every other communion that makes for its corner-stone the Sonship and Messiahship of Jesus, for they all are brethren." It may be true that the Disciples of Mr. Alexander Campbell are thus easily at home among others, but we feel assured that observation and experience has

taught many a pastor that they are present as *Disciples* with the strong beliefs and advocacy of the practices of Disciples. Lutherans, Presbyterians, Baptists and others are not strong believers in the non-sectarian claims of these Christian people. Churches with some centuries of history like the Lutherans and the older Reformed bodies, are not likely to flock in large numbers into a communion with the basis of the Disciples and but 104 years of history in the earth. A reader of the papers of this body of Christians will refuse to confess to the absence of the sectarian spirit even among the pronounced enemies of all sectarianism. Consistent followers of Mr. Campbell are not, it would seem, in a state of inviting tranquility among themselves. Judging from what we see in their denominational journals, such as "The Christian Standard" and the "Christian Evangelist," say we not well that those who are talking most about Church union and are ready "to fight for peace," are themselves sometimes the most conspicuous examples of disunion and strife.

When we come to study the Episcopal proposals for the same end we encounter another class of obstacles that show plainly the impracticability of the ideals cherished by that venerable and stately body of Christians. No denomination talks so much about unity and none imposes greater difficulties to be surmounted. It is promoting a great movement for Christian unity and yet its attitude toward other churches goes on practically unchanged. It does not, so far as can be discerned, recognize other churches as churches at all, but so far as the writer has observed, they are always referred to as "religious bodies." Rome will not recognize its orders, and it will not recognize the orders of the other Protestant churches. No Church is more completely isolated or less truly catholic. As for its own internal life it is not Roman enough for some even of its own members nor Protestant enough for others. "High" churchmen go on year after year from one stage of incredible narrowness to another more narrow and less conceivable. The smug comfort of their self-satisfaction does not seem to be diminished by the closer pinch of their contracting ideas.

The "Living Church" is a leading organ of that part of the Episcopal Church known as "high." There was a movement in the Canadian churches pertaining to the "closer co-operation of

Christian people," which was held by the lofty brethren to "cheapen their Church and its episcopate."

Of that movement in Canada the "Living Church" had this to say:

"The Canadian Church is hotly discussing a proposal to take some steps looking toward greater comity with our separated brethren. We have already referred to a circular letter signed by a number of clergymen asking that ministers of other bodies may be permitted to preach in church pulpits, and that members of such bodies should be permitted to receive Holy Communion at our altars, all in the interest of Christian unity. These proposals are being very carefully considered. That they are also being rejected as impossible by all really orthodox, well-grounded churchmen, goes without saying. They must, however, pass through the process of serious discussion, ere they appear in the provincial or the general synods. Eventually, we doubt not, they will receive that courteous quietus that has been the fate of so many well-intended ecclesiastical experiments heretofore."

Contemplating the dire possibility of what might have come to pass had other Canadian Christians been accorded the courtesy of even scant recognition the Living Church says further:

"Suppose the thing were done. A Protestant minister, lacking Episcopal ordination, owing no allegiance to the Bishop of the diocese, is standing in the pulpit. What is this intended to mean? That he is a priest? Again we are told that no awkward questions must be asked. Well, awkward questions ask themselves. Is he a priest? It is quite obvious that laymen and deacons are at liberty to occupy the pulpit when licensed by the bishop. But no one supposes that they could celebrate the Holy Eucharist. Are we to answer that the Protestant preacher cannot do so either? Then if he has not the power, what contribution toward Christian comity has been made by accentuating this defect in the validity of his ministry? If he has the power, and we invite him, as it were, to make an after dinner speech but not to eat with us, what courtesy have we shown him? Is the mere act of preaching from an Anglican pulpit a single honor that the minister will be too dazzled by its splendor to see how we have snubbed him? And so instead of courtesy we offer him an insult."

One of the leading speakers at the late meeting of the Federal

Council of the Churches at Chicago was the Episcopal Bishop Anderson of that large diocese. The bishop is an able man and is said to have made an able and inspiring address. Soon after this address was given a member of the Episcopal Cathedral of Chicago applied for a letter to join a Congregational Church. In reply to the request a letter was received signed by the dean of the Cathedral and having at its top the name of Bishop Anderson. It read:

"I am in receipt of application for membership signed by Blank. May I say that once a Churchman always a Churchman, and there is no such thing as transferring from the Church to a religious body. Mrs. Blank will remain on the Church books until such time as she has violated the canons of the Church, which will make her removal of her name necessary from the cathedral register."

These are but samples of the temper in which high church Episcopalianists are discussing the practical questions of their relation to other Christian bodies. Why should any member of that Church, be he "high" or "low" or "broad" deem this a hopeful time for his communion to be making proposals of union to other Churches, with a faith, with antecedents and signs of approval from the Head of the Church? In view of the attitude toward other churches noted above, what is the use of bemoaning with bitter lamentations the divided state of Christendom? In view of this attitude the "Reunion of Protestantism" not only is a long way off, but even comity is likely to be regarded as undesirable and impracticable among such as are classified with some condescension as "Religious bodies" and "our separated brethren." It has even been declared by the "Living Church," that had the Episcopal body in the famous incident of 1907, even extended a half-concealed hand of fraternal recognition over the wall to its fellow Christians as it thought of doing in that year, that simple, and as was afterwards explained meaningless bit of courtesy, would "have disrupted the American church."

Ministers of other churches, we have observed are showing no special eagerness to speak to the people from Episcopal pulpits. They have their own in churches just as apostolic and are the representatives of a ministry whose ordination is as valid and to which there may be credited as many evidences of the divine ap-

proval. They are more concerned to note whether or not the Episcopal church is acting in good faith in its frequently expressed desire for a reunion of Protestantism. The negotiations are not likely to make much permanent advancement so long as the teachers of other churches are not regarded as ordained ministers and their churches not a part of the true church. Condescending expressions of civility have about reached their limit of effectiveness and there is but little use to continue the discussion of that which every one who thinks of the matter seriously, must recognize as impracticable.

It is the judgment of some whole communions too that, in its program, the Episcopal church is minimizing the real thing of primary importance, viz. the faith of the church. As an important step in further proceedings there should be an examination of their own ministry by Episcopalianas as to their attitude toward the Thirty-nine articles, the creed of their church. When they once get the beam of division into "High," "Low" and "Broad" out of the eyes of the ministry of their own church, when they care more for the beliefs of their ministers, they will see more clearly to cast out the beams from other peoples eyes.

There too are the claims in behalf of an alleged "Historic Episcopate," and what we must regard as an "Apostolic succession" having no basis in either Scripture or history. An English organ of one of the dissenting churches has well stated it when it says

"This bar to relations between the Anglican Church and the churches which are not Anglican is one that arises in all parts of the world; and, although the man in the pew is commonly uninterested, because uninformed in the refinements of discussions concerning orders, he has a sufficient amount of *amour propre* to insist that any fraternization between his own church and others shall be conducted upon the basis of absolute equality... The matter is not within the region of practical politics at present, but the opinions cited seem to suggest that, until the Christian churches are prepared to throw the whole question of apostolic succession out of the window, no one need waste time or breath in discussing any scheme for the unification of the Christian churches."

This puts this matter plainly. The condition of an acceptance of this "apostolic succession" was the weak point of the

famous Lambeth articles of some years ago, and we predict it will be the weak point, or the rock of offence in the discussions of the world's conference of faith and order. Even regenerate human nature among Lutherans and Presbyterians, for example, is not likely to submit to the most kindly administered assurance that the ordination administered in these churches by the laying on of non-Episcopal hands is not as ecclesiastically valid and as honored of God as that of the Anglican and Episcopal churches. The lately deceased Dr. Charles A. Briggs, who was at the time of his death an Episcopal clergyman and a scholar of wide attainments, whose conservative position on matters more fundamental announced before his death has given great comfort and strength to all evangelical Christians, has said what greatly strengthens our contention on this phase of our discussion. Writing of the Anglo-Catholics, who he says "really desire the reunion of Christendom, but who make their theory of the Episcopate essential." Dr. Briggs says, "They are entitled to argue for it to the extent of their ability, but they should understand that if they make their theory *essential* there is no possibility of reunion. They must first conquer other parties in the Episcopal churches before they can have any prospect of over-coming the hosts in the non-Episcopal churches, which so far as my observation goes are unanimous against them." "Recent historical research is very damaging to all *Jura divino* theories of church government." What this learned scholar has affirmed herein will not help other churches to hasten their pace forward moving over into another fold especially where they must pass over a winding road of graduated deacons, presbyters and bishops.

But we are glad to note the fact that at last these two bodies, the Disciples and Episcopalians have been getting together for a face to face and heart to heart conference on these matters of union so dear to the hearts of both. Both have talked much about it and each, as we have seen, has done much to defeat it. The one holds fast to what he regards as apostolic baptism and the other to what he conjectures to be apostolic ordination.

Each in their turn have censured other churches for their wicked and perverse sectarianism and called heaven to witness that it was not a sect. The one by its insistence upon a particular mode of administering the sacrament of baptism has consigned to the uncovenanted mercies of God the vast majority of

Christian people. The other by labored and ingenious argumentation has exalted an external rite of the church to a height and magnitude to which in the estimate of the vast majority of Christians it is not entitled. We are glad that at last these two denominations, the great specialists in the propaganda for church union have begun to turn their attention to one another. On the first day of their conference an able and learned "Disciple" is said to have read a long and learned paper on the necessity of immersion, while the Episcopalians listened with much courtesy. On the next day a learned Episcopalian read a paper in which he showed to the satisfaction at least of his own brethren present, that, while different modes of ordination existed or were held by different denominations to exist, it would greatly and certainly hasten the union in which both were interested, if everybody should be ordained by a bishop. The Disciples are said to have listened with courtesy and to have declared that it was a learned paper.

The compliments were mutual and received with satisfaction, and the end reached in the passage of some resolutions. We are glad that these denominations are turning their attention to each other, that they are discussing their own differences. When the meeting becomes more comprehensive in its scope we feel assured that some troublesome questions will likely be asked of both, and we cherish the hope that each will be made to see plainly how preposterous and uninviting his position is destined to prove as a basis of unification for the rest of Christendom.

Deploring the evils of Sectarianism, the issuing of manifestos about the "scandal of Christendom," calling on all the churches to confer on the subject are foredoomed to failure on lines of union advocated by Disciples and Episcopalians. To make the matters for which each stubbornly stands fundamental is foreign to the entire spirit and teaching of the gospel of our Lord. It is to push into an unwarranted prominence things not so exalted in Scripture or history. These good people, who no doubt mean well, must know that there is some difference between union and absorption.

4. Is there then no hope for such a thing as Christian union, and are we to settle down in the conviction that the promotion of a merely external good fellowship or an expression of a willingness to disagree is the best way to bring the desirable end to

pass? Much of the uncertainty and perplexity on the subject will vanish if we give ourselves to a candid contemplation of such a unity as already exists, such as is Scriptural and reasonable to expect. The differences between Christian people are not to be set down to the credit of obstinate blindness or incurable prejudice. A very real argument may be found among Christians, if we only seek after the real things on which it is possible to manifest such agreement. Though a unity of Christian convictions may never come within our reach, we may make a very much nearer approach to a unity of Christian tempers. We may attain to more of it, if we remember that the real unity of the kingdom is more biological than mechanical, of the spirit rather than of the body, and such unity we may have now and are getting in fuller measure every day. The task before us is not the task of making a unity which man can neither make nor unmake, but it is that of manifesting to the world here and now that inward spiritual unity which always exists between all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. There is one holy Catholic church. It was so taught by our Lord and confirmed unto us by those who heard Him. All who believe in our Lord and Saviour and trust to Him alone for salvation we are bound to consider as one in Him, the head of the body of the Church, and that church we feel assured consists of all such, however much they may differ as to the mere scaffolding of Christianity. These are in the true unity of the faith, for the gospel tells us over and over again that all who believe in Christ are saved, and if so they must be in the one Church of the saved. The kind of unity that is attainable and that is to be emphasized is that which is based on the confession of a common faith, and not that which is imposed by a common organization. We need a deeper unity than that of government even that inner unity that shows itself as a universal fellowship, among such as stand fast in the unity of faith.

The union spoken of in the Scriptures is never that form of government, nor of method of operation, nor even of details of conviction. It is distinctly announced as that of one God and Savior, one faith, one baptism. To press universal union beyond that is imperialism in religion. It is to make a plea for something of a return to the solidarity of the middle ages. History has something to teach us on this line that when the Church has

been most nearly one outwardly it has been least effective in bearing its testimony as the pillar and ground of the truth. Union built upon the mere suppression of discordant ideas in the machinery of one vast external organism is more than useless. The theory that there can be no real unity which does not result in some sort of external union is fallacious, harmful and impracticable for realization.

The unity that is permanent, that is useful and desirable is that in which great common beliefs are at its foundation, the deepest and most masterful convictions that control men, faith relating to God and sin and salvation, to all the vital conditions of this world and of that which is to come. One is not warranted in hoping for much for the success of movements, either in politics, business or religion that rest upon negotiation and compromise as to externals, while the temper and beliefs of the people remain divergent. There is more importance to be attached to what the lawyers call "the meeting of the minds."

There is a form of union that is both practicable and urgent, and that is the unity that should be fostered and advanced between related bodies in the same household of faith. Why should not more even of organic union be sought within these? Would not this be the natural method?

All the leading branches of the Christian church such as the Lutherans, the Presbyterians and others, are rooted in certain historical antecedents and it is not an easy task to dislodge them from that which has gone before. The labor and even prayer for unity will avail but little if these historic roots are in any considerable measure ignored. We would not express our sentiment in such strong language as those who refer to the present divided state of Protestantism as "the scandal of Christendom," yet many of these divisions among people who confess the same apprehension of the gospel present a sad and deplorable and inexcusable spectacle. The people who represent many of them would have a task of some proportions to give a reason for their continued existence. That people who are in the unity of the same faith are often divided and torn with envies and jealousies, parties and strifes and even rent asunder, is a sad and depressing fact. Would it not be cause for rejoicing among all men of good will, if, in each instance, these closely related groups could be brought together in real and harmonious union. The union

about to be effected between the United Brethren body and the Methodist Protestants is commendable and practicable an end to be contemplated with pleasure. These churches are composed of people who hold the same doctrines, are practically one in government and as a rule use the same methods of religious work. Their coming together is a case of reversal to type. The union attempted a few years ago between the Congregationalists, the United Brethren and the Methodist Protestants came to naught as was to be expected. It was an attempt at unification by means of the abrogation of type. The Congregationalists are rooted in a past of one order the others in a past of briefer duration and of another and different order.

This unity among the more closely related families ought not to impose a visionary and impossible task. It should be practicable and its realization is certainly urgent. Can any man give any good and sufficient reason for the cultivation and perpetuation of disunity for example among Lutherans in this country, when as a gratifying fact they have arrived at what they themselves regard as the matter of importance, viz. greater unity in matters of faith than any other branch of Protestantism. A community of belief does not always mean identity of views. But we are constrained to the opinion that, considering the importance of its work and the greatness of the opportunities of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in this land, its accredited teachers ought to be willing to surrender such things as are an offense to multitudes of their brethren and which continue to beget distrust, alienation and division. The love for the Church is one of the deepest and strongest bonds of union in the world and that should be given up which continues as mutually exclusive views. St. Paul bids us to give "diligence to keep the unity of the spirit." In a large measure unity is within our control and we can keep it or lose it or at least impede its progress. It is hard to justify anything that continues to weaken the Church of Christ and put it to an open shame before the world. People who are sheltered in the one household of faith should at least shun the narrow spirit and the arrogant tempter, and avoid all intolerance and antagonism.

Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE III.

LUTHERAN INSTITUTIONS IN THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG AND ITS ANNIVERSARY.

BY ELSIE SINGMASTER LEWARS.

Fifty years ago the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY contained an article on the "Battle of Gettysburg," written by Doctor Michael Jacobs, then a professor in the College, who was an eye-witness of the great conflict. It is appropriate that in this anniversary year mention should be made in the same journal of the connection of the institutions of the Lutheran Church with the battle and with its Fiftieth Anniversary. Two of our Churches and two of our important educational institutions, the Theological Seminary and Pennsylvania College, were within the battle lines and were put to various uses by the contending armies.

The property of the Theological Seminary at the time of the battle consisted of three buildings, the fine colonial building which was at the same time dormitory, chapel, library and recitation hall, and two handsome residences in which lived Professors S. S. Schmucker and Charles Philip Krauth. On the evening of the day before the battle, General Buford's cavalry encamped on Seminary Ridge, and early in the morning of July the First, General Buford, hearing that the enemy was advancing in force hastened to the cupola of the Seminary to make observation. From this elevated position he beheld the advance of a large mass of Confederate troops, and from here also his eager eyes strained to detect the approach of reinforcements from the Union Army lying miles away to the South. When General Reynolds arrived, he too sought the cupola. A few minutes later he was killed as he rode about encouraging his soldiers in the woods nearby. In the afternoon, when the Confederates had dislodged the Union forces and had themselves taken possession of Seminary Ridge, the cupola became an important signal station.

The Schmucker and Krauth families were ordered to leave their homes, and both of these houses and the Seminary building were badly damaged. All fences, sheds and other small structures were entirely demolished. Through Doctor Schmucker's

house passed thirteen shells. His books were taken from their shelves and torn and his furniture ruined. He held pronounced views about the evils of human slavery and the inborn right of all men to be free; it is supposed that the Confederates had knowledge of this fact and that, therefore, his property suffered so severely.

After the battle the Seminary building was used for many weeks as a hospital. There was printed in the *Lutheran Observer* for July 10 a letter from Doctor Hay of Harrisburg, the President of the Board of Directors, urging that directors about to meet in Gettysburg come prepared with all the articles they could carry for the comfort of the wounded.

At its meeting on August 11, 1863, the Board of Directors of the Seminary passed a resolution similar to that passed by the College Board commanding the bravery of the students who had enlisted in the army. It resolved also, "from motives of patriotism and gratitude to God for the glorious victory vouchsafed our arms that no compensation be solicited from the government for damages sustained to the buildings." For the making of repairs free will offerings were solicited from the churches and \$4,210 secured. The government afterwards paid \$660 for the use of the buildings as a hospital, but no recompense for damages received, nor would it have been accepted. Apparently no harm was wantonly done to the buildings. A student returning after the battle to secure the "claw hammer," coat and patent leather shoes which a friend had entrusted to his care, found them in the cupboard in his room and only a few tablets of scratch paper missing from the drawers of his desk.

The College buildings played a no less important part in the history of the battle. At the end of the first day the Confederates held the town, and the large and handsome main College building was at once put to use as a Confederate Hospital. Into its library and recitation rooms were carried the wounded, probably about five hundred in number, and here wounds were dressed, limbs amputated—without anaesthetic of any kind—and eyes were closed forever. The soldiers who died here were buried on the College campus. In the fall, when frost had made it safe to open the numerous and terrible trenches, the bodies of Union soldiers were transferred to single graves in the National Cemetery.

tery. Later the bodies of Confederates were sent to Southern Cemeteries.

The College building was thus used for about four weeks after the departure of the armies. For the damage done to the College property an indemnity of \$625 was paid by the government. The Commencement exercises, held usually in August, were omitted, although the College issued its regular program. By September 24, the work of cleansing and repairing was completed and the College was ready to begin its fall term.

The cupola of the College as well as that of the Seminary was used for observation. From there on the morning of the first of July, Professor Jacobs indicated to one of General Howard's signal officers the value of Culp's Hill as a strategic point, a position which was later fortified and occupied with important result. On the third of July General Lee observed from the cupola the weakness of the left center of the Union line. It is probable that this observation led to the ordering of Pickett's charge, a manoeuvre so fatal to the Confederate cause.

The account of the battle by Doctor Jacobs, under the title of "The Rebel Invasion of Pennsylvania," is known and valued by all students. Other members of the faculty had a part in the great incidents of which the little town was the scene. The Reverend Doctor Baugher, Sr., President of the College, pronounced the benediction over the great gathering which listened to the immortal speech of Abraham Lincoln at the dedication of the National Cemetery on November 19, 1863. General Herman Haupt, a former member of the faculty, a graduate of West Point in the same class with General Meade, and at the time of the battle, Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Transportation of the United States Military Railroads, performed an important duty in restoring railroad and telegraph communications between Gettysburg and Washington by the night of July 4th following the battle. General Haupt also journeyed to Washington to beg that General Meade be directed to follow General Lee's army.

From the College and the Seminary a company of lads answered the call of Governor Curtin for troops in June 1863, and were the first company to be mustered in. In this company (Co. A, 26th Regt. P. V. M.) were about sixty college students, a majority of the College, four Seminary students and some

young men from the town of Gettysburg. Among the number were Frederick Klinefelter, a Seminarian, who was captain of the company, Samuel D. Schmucker, who became Judge of the Supreme Court of Maryland, Orlando Fegley, afterwards a distinguished physician of Allentown, Pa., Edmund J. Wolf, later a professor in the Seminary, Matthias Richards, later a professor in Muhlenberg College, Thomas C. Billheimer, later a professor in the Seminary, Adjutant Harvey W. McKnight, who afterwards became President of the College, Theodore L. Seip, afterwards President of Muhlenberg College, and others who attained positions of honor in their Church and in their professions.

This company took part in a sharp skirmish with the Confederate Cavalry near Gettysburg, and was afterwards ordered to Harrisburg to aid in the protection of that important point. On the way to Harrisburg the company marched fifty-four out of sixty consecutive hours. The young soldiers remained on duty until July 30, when their term of service expired. In comment upon their action, the Board of Trustees passed the following resolution:

"That this Board has heard with proud satisfaction of the heroic conduct of those students of the College who rushed so promptly to the defense of their country during the late rebel invasion, and that their course is hereby heartily approved."

In August of 1864 another invasion of Pennsylvania was threatened, and the Commencement exercises were again interfered with, as all but two of the graduating class had gone to their homes. To these two a baccalaureate sermon was preached after each had delivered his Commencement address.

Both the College Church and St. James Church were used as hospitals; on the steps of the former a Union chaplain was shot when about to enter to minister to the wounded and dying. The parsonage of St. James Church was occupied for a time by General Longstreet. Members of both churches assisted in the works of mercy which the needs of thousands of sufferers demanded.

Never was there a more peaceful village than Gettysburg, a village more suited in its quietness and seclusion to academic pursuits. Never had two institutions whose greatest object was the spreading of the gospel of peace a more terrible baptism of fire and blood. Surely this great experience has had its result

upon their students and teachers in a deeper devotion to the high ideals set up by the framers of the constitution and supported by Abraham Lincoln and the famous warriors who shed their blood on this field. Every student who enters the gates of the College or climbs the hill to the Seminary has heard again and again the thrilling tales of the deeds done here in '63. If his heart has not been thrilled, if he has not felt that he is a part of a nation peculiarly united, he is dull indeed.

In his account of the battle, Professor Jacobs prays for the speedy coming of the day, "when the whole country shall be united again, the old animosity forgotten, a true friendship restored, and peace and prosperity going hand in hand to bless and gladden all the people."

Such a day have the Lutheran institutions in Gettysburg lived to see, and in the celebration of the anniversary of the battle they have proudly borne their part, have been glad witnesses to the fact that after fifty years hostile armies met on the ground consecrated by the blood of their comrades to declare against sectionalism, to affirm a country indissolubly united, and to proclaim peace forever hallowed and immortal throughout our land.

Surely history has never recorded so remarkable a gathering. In the valley between the two famous ridges was pitched the great camp of about six thousand tents. From the Seminary cupola, where fifty years ago General Buford stood gazing longingly toward the South, praying for reinforcements, Union and Confederate veterans could now look out upon a brightly lighted city of tents, a city of sixty thousand inhabitants, the honorary guests of a loyal State and a grateful Nation, one time enemies, now forever friends. They came from Maine and New Hampshire, from Texas and California, Virginians who had been led by Pickett, North Carolinians who followed Hoke and Pettigrew, South Carolinians who faced death under Jenkins and McGowan, Pennsylvanians under Birney and Webb, New Yorkers under Greene and Brooks, Vermonters under Stannard. They came in their uniforms of blue and gray, they came with their tattered banners, with their wounds, with their memory of conflict, and finally, with love for their country and their fellow-men.

It has been estimated that in this great gathering there were about seventy thousand veterans in all, with sixty thousand as the largest number assembled at any one time. Besides the vet-

erans, about ten thousand visitors had lodgings in the town. The number of those who came and went in a day in carriages and automobiles it was not possible to estimate. It seemed that this great assemblage was guarded by Providence, since it was almost entirely without accident, and the deaths—only nine—were far fewer than might have been expected in a host composed of men much above middle life. The State Health Department provided in every possible way for the health of those present, and the State Constabulary and Government Troops cared for their safety.

The College and the Seminary, which played such an important part in the battle fifty years ago, threw wide their doors to the distinguished guests. The president of the Seminary, Dr. J. A. Singmaster, served as the chairman of the Citizens' Committee, from which came the first proposal for the celebration of the Fiftieth Anniversary.

The college campus formed the headquarters of the Fiftieth Anniversary Commission appointed by the Governor to prepare for the celebration. Here the guests were lodged in the dormitories and in tents. Among them were prominent officials of the State of Pennsylvania and about twenty-five governors of other States. Governor Eberhardt, of Minnesota, a Lutheran, was one of the speakers at the great tent where the exercises were held. The Governor of Pennsylvania and Mrs. Tener were guests at the house of President Granville.

On the campus of the College a reception was tendered to Vice President Marshall and the Committee appointed by Congress, to attend the celebration, and from the neighborhood of Glatfelter Hall the Presidential salute was fired. Here also the State Constabulary were quartered. Their services in the preservation of order and the promotion of comfort and safety cannot be overstated.

The Seminary may be said to have witnessed even more remarkable and stirring sights and sounds. Here the families of Union and Confederate officers slept under the same roof and ate at the same table, the children and grandchildren of Meade and Longstreet, the daughters of Hill and Heth, the grandsons of Pickett. Here on the quiet hillside, a little apart from the sound and stir of the great gathering, sat distinguished groups, talking over their country's past, discussing problems of present moment,

famous Law of Longstreet's Corps, venerable Grant of Sedgwick's Corps.

"Good morning," said the charming daughter of a Confederate general to the grandchildren of a Union general. "Come sit down beside me. Just fifty years ago this morning my father met your grandfather here on this spot."

The Gettysburg Churches were filled on Sunday. Many whose wounds had been dressed there half a century ago visited the College Church. Others were drawn thither by the memory of their beloved chaplain, who had met his death there on the steps. In the churches many bore witness to their faith.

A Union veteran stood at Spangler's Spring, notable in history as the mingling place of Union and Confederate soldiers on the night of the second day's fight. The old soldier, too infirm to bend down for a drink, was handed water by a young man. One who knew the youth, and saw from the old man's badge that he belonged to a regiment which had helped to repel Pickett's charge, said to the veteran, "That was General Pickett's grandson who gave you that drink of water."

Tears ran down the cheeks of the soldier.

"We fought him at the Angle, and here I come back after fifty years and his grandson gives me a drink of cold water! Thank God for this day! God bless you, my lad! Thank God for peace!"

One might dwell on many such scenes, the fond meetings of comrades after fifty years, the strange encounters of those who left each other for dead on this field, the affecting sight at the Angle when Union and Confederate met with hand-clasps who half a century ago had met with double canister and the bayonet's point, the thrilling sight of one thousand Virginians marching to the Seminary, their banners waving and above them all the Stars and Stripes, to receive back again a Confederate flag taken from them in battle.

On Little Round Top, on the night of the Third, before an audience of thousands, the sights and sounds of battle were again produced in a magnificent pyrotechnic display. Again shells burst in air, minnie balls hissed, artillery thundered. The crest burst into fire as in a great siege. Here emblazoned were the corps marks and the names of great commanders, and here a

crowning piece, two soldiers, one in blue, one in gray, clasping hands beneath the glowing Stars and Stripes.

It seemed that here the climax of the celebration had been reached. But at noon, on the Fourth of July, the Union Signal Corps gave warning that Pickett's men were forming in the woods along Seminary Ridge. Then from height to height the signals flashed. The Union flags waved the signal first, the dying words of Robert E. Lee, "Duty is the noblest word in our language." The Confederates waved back the dying words of Grant, "Let us have peace." Then, promptly, came the answer which a thankful nation echoes, "Peace on earth, good will to men."

Surely, in the words of the President of the United States to the veterans assembled in the great tent, these fifty years have meant "peace and union and vigor and the maturity and might of a great nation." We pray with him that "the day of our country's life has but broadened into morning."

To us who are members of the Lutheran Church, spiritual descendants of the great Liberator of modern thought, it should be a source of satisfaction that we have been thus connected with so mighty a struggle for the cause of human freedom.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE IV.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF RELIGION.¹

BY REV. PAUL HAROLD HEISEY, M. A.

The growth of the science and study of psychology has been phenomenal in recent years. It may be said that "it began with an analysis of simple ideas and feelings, and it has developed to an insight into the mechanism of the highest acts and emotions, thoughts and creations. It started by studying the mental life of the individual, and it has rushed forward to the physical organization of society, to social psychology, to the psychology of art and science, religion and language, history and law."² The application of psychology and the methods of science to religion is of recent date.

Much that had been done in the fields of anthropology, history of religion, and the philosophy of religion borders on that which has come to be distinctively known as the psychology of religion. The first work attempted in the field of the psychology of religion as a distinctive study was that by Professor E. D. Starbuck, Ph.D. While a student in college (1886-1890) he was very much interested in the study of Comparative Religion. While teaching at Vincennes College (1891-1893) he read Max Müller's volume on "Science of Religion," which gave him a fresh impulse in the study of religion and also crystallized his own longings after the possibility of applying empirical methods to the study of religion. Resigning his position he entered Harvard University in 1893 to pursue studies related to his chosen field of inquiry. On arriving at Harvard he issued two questionaries, one on "Conversion," and the other on "The Line of Growth in Religious Experience," not attended by conversion. Previous to this, in 1890, Professor Starbuck read a paper before the Indiana College Association, which was his "first crystallization of vague ideas which had been forming, that religion might be studied in the more careful ways we call scientific, with profit to

1 A paper read before the Joint Session of the Eastern and Western Conferences of the Iowa Synod (G. S.), at Oxford Junction, Iowa, April 29, 1913.

2 Münsterberg, *Psychology and Life*, p. 2.

both science and religion." The Psychology of religion as a field of investigation was soon taken up by the faculty and students of Clark University.³ This school had paid much attention to the study of adolescence and this study brought forth many interesting facts relating to the religious experience of adolescents. As early as 1882, Dr. G. Stanley Hall contributed a paper to the *Princeton Review* entitled "The Moral and Religious Training of Children," which opened the way for more extensive studies along the same line. Mr. William H. Burnham and Arthur H. Daniels made investigations which were of a nature of the psychology of religion although leaning toward anthropology and adolescent psychology. In 1896 Professor James H. Lueba published a paper on "The Psychology of Religious Phenomena" in which he dealt chiefly with the conversion experience. This was followed by the work of Mr. E. G. Lancaster, and later the published work of Professor Starbuck entitled "The Psychology of Religion." This latter was the first large publication bearing upon this new field of study. The author himself admits that the title was a misnomer, since the volume dealt with only a few of the problems of the new-born science and was in no sense a complete survey or treatment of the subject, which it could not have been at that early stage of development. This work has remained as one of the two or three great contributions to the science of the psychology of religion. The sub-title of the work by Dr. Starbuck is "an empirical study of the religious consciousness." Other early studies in this field were those of Professor George A. Coe which bore the title "The Spiritual Life: Studies in the Science of Religion," the studies of Luther H. Gulick on "Age, Sex, and Conversion." It is striking to know that though Professors Coe and Starbuck worked independently they arrived at very much the same conclusions in reference to the religious awakening of adolescents and also in reference to the conversion experience.

Probably the next great contribution to this field which should be mentioned is Professor William James' volume on "Varieties of Religious Experience." This entered a larger field than the psychology of the religious consciousness and involved the philo-

³ For a sketch of the history of this science see "The Psychology of Religion," by James B. Pratt, *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. I, No. 4, p. 435. However, this article does not do justice to the work of Professor Starbuck.

sophical side of religion in that it sought the ultimate significance of the facts upon the problems of religion. Other studies which should be mentioned in the development of the science of the psychology of religion are Davenport's "Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals," Pratt's "The Psychology of Religious Belief," Stratton's "The Psychology of the Religious Life," Ames' "The Psychology of Religious Experience," Lueba's "A Psychological Study of Religion," King's "The Development of Religion," and Warner's "The Psychology of the Christian Life." Though we have not mentioned all of the contributions to this field of study, the above sketch points out the chief studies and the main lines of the development of the science.

The very nature of religion warrants a psychological study of it. "Religious experience is made up of the same elements as the rest of the conscious life, and these elements are connected and elaborated according to laws holding for mental life generally." From the standpoint of psychology, religion is a "mass of ascertainable states of consciousness." Thus, the psychology of religion can be looked upon as a branch of psychology dealing with the religious consciousness only, or that part of consciousness which is concerned with that which we term religion, and the activities connected with it. The psychology of religion is the search for law, for uniformities among religious phenomena. In the thought of Professor Coe, the search is one to determine "under what circumstances does the Divine Spirit work such or such a change in the minds of men?"⁴ This is in harmony with the starting point or ideal of the psychology of religion as a science: "There is no event in the spiritual life which does not occur in accordance with immutable laws." This does not imply that man will discover all these laws, or having discovered them will be able to determine their full significance. In any sphere a law is an abstract thing and in the field of religion as in other fields we can determine many things that will be of concrete value though not obtaining all abstract law in the particular field. "The end of our study is not to resolve the mystery of religion, but to bring enough of it into orderliness that its facts may appeal to our understanding."

It might be argued that such a study of the religious life

⁴ George A. Coe: *The Spiritual Life*, p. 17.

would "drag it down" or destroy its majesty. But surely botany has not dragged down the beauty of the flower nor has astronomy destroyed the majesty of the heavens. The discovery of law and uniformity exalts the object in which it is found. Every new discovery is a new bit of knowledge of God. Every new law is a new evidence of God. "All's law, but all's God." George Steven writes in his "Psychology of the Christian Soul:" "The spiritual process is God working through the minds of men." The scientist in any field does not concern himself with the ultimate origin of things but with facts concerning it as observed in life and his task is the interpretation of these facts. So, "the explanations of religion which the psychologist and the sociologist can give leave unanswered, of course, the question of ultimate origin."

Whether or not we can speak of a science of the psychology of religion is a debatable question. It is perfectly clear that as yet we have no well developed science of the psychology of religion. Whether we can have is yet to be seen. This question hinges somewhat upon our definition of a science and our conception of scientific law. As yet we have very little in the way of generalized truths from the study of the psychology of religion and yet the psychology of religion presupposes that there is law in the spiritual realm as in the natural realm. When these laws, or some of them, are discovered we shall approach a science, until then the psychology of religion will concern itself with discovering the facts of the religious life and consciousness, describing them, classifying them, and attempting to explain them. The charge might be brought that science should not invade the inner chambers of the soul and search for laws there, but science has faced objection in every step of its progress until now it has come to invade the most sacred precincts. It has left religion for its final and supreme task.

There is somewhat of general agreement as to the field of the psychology of religion although not all investigators have conceived of the work and the scope of it in exactly the same way. Some have placed the emphasis upon the rise and development of religion in the race, while others have placed the emphasis upon the study of the religious consciousness of the individual. Others have taken both views into account.

"The business of the psychology of religion," according to

Professor Starbuck, "is to bring together a systematized body of evidence which shall make it possible to comprehend new regions in the spiritual life of man, and to read old dogmas in larger and fresher light."⁵

According to Professor Ames: "The psychologist of religion accepts the facts of religion, the temples and priests, the sacred books and ceremonies, the faiths and the customs which exist in such profusion throughout the world. He seeks to know the needs, impulses, and desires from which these institutions and activities arise. He inquires concerning the circumstances under which they appear in the race and the individual. He attempts to trace their development into settled institutions, doctrines, and emotions. He marks the part they play, the function they perform in the experience of the individual and of society."⁶ For Professor Pratt, the work of the psychologist of religion is "to describe the workings of the human mind, as far as they are influenced by its attitude toward the Determiner of Destiny."⁷

The specific work of the psychology of the Christian life is indicated by Dr. Warner in these words: "Christian psychology is the study of the soul in its exhibition of the phenomena of the Christian life. It is the systematic, scientific knowledge of psychical activities involved in Christian experience and their coordinations in conduct and character. It is the exploration of the entire field of inter-related phenomena appearing in the life of the Christian. It is the classification of all the facts thus discoverable in their correlated order. It is the formulation of the evident laws of the spiritual, experimental action developed under the Gospel of Jesus Christ."⁸

These definitions indicate the various phases of the work, the distinctively psychological, both the individual and social; and the anthropological and sociological.

In the past much of the study of the psychology of religion has been devoted to investigations of the conversion experience. Professor Starbuck's book considered conversion, lines of growth

5 Starbuck: *The Psychology of Religion*, p. 6.

6 Ames: *The Psychology of Religious Experience*, p. 13.

7 Pratt: *The Psychology of Religion*, in *The Journal of Religious Psychology*, Vol. 5, No. 4, p. 383.

8 Warner: *The Psychology of the Christian Life*, p. 33.

not including conversion, and a comparison of the lines of growth with and without conversion. But the field is much larger and studies have been made of faith, prayer, revelations, religious states and religious practices. The chief problems of the psychology of religion have been classified by Professor James H. Leuba under four heads: "(1) The impulses, motives and aims; (2) the means employed to reach the ends—ceremonial, prayer, communion, etc.; (3) the results secured; (4) the means and the results considered in relation of cause and effect."⁹ Again, the field of the psychology of religion might be further indicated by these additional subjects: the determination of 'what is religion?' types of belief, mysticism, storm and stress in adolescence, habit and conversion, the meaning of regeneration, the meaning of sanctification, a study of the religious instinct, religion as a harmonizing instinct, religion as a stimulus to life, religion and conduct, temperament in religion, the meaning of religion in personal and social life.

Chiefly the empirical method is being used in the psychology of religion. The earliest investigators adopted the questionnaire method which since then has been used extensively in this field of inquiry, though discredited at the present time as not being very scientific and as not getting at the facts in the best manner. In gathering data use has been made of autobiographies, biographies, letters, spontaneous expressions, history, anthropology, and informal discussions. The older methods have been supplanted by the analytical and the experimental.

We need not fear this invasion of science into religion, for assuming that we live in a world of order we cannot conclude other than that law operates in the spiritual realm and in the religious consciousness as in the rest of life. The psychology of religion does not imply the elimination of the supernatural from religion and the religious life unless the evidence of law in nature is the ground for eliminating the supernatural from the natural. Contending that such dread is needless, Dr. Warner writes: "Scrutiny can change no fact. Truths are the same in the shadow or in the sunlight. Realities are invulnerable and unchangeable to whatever process subjected. The constituent elements of the life we call Christian are substantial, real, unalter-

⁹ Leuba: *A Psychological Study of Religion*.

able. They are the eternal verities of the life begotten of God in the soul. No possible handling can render them less real or change their essential nature. The dread of their scrutiny is a confession either of our inability to demonstrate their substantial nature or of our imperfect faith in their indestructible reality. All such dread is without adequate reason and actually groundless.”¹⁰

We can anticipate most wholesome results from this study of religion from the psychological standpoint, not only for science but especially for religion itself, for from the viewpoint of the pastor and religious worker the psychology of religion exists for religion and not religion for psychology. Very suggestive are the words of Professor James in his introduction to Professor Starbuck’s book: “Rightly interpreted, the whole tendency of Dr. Starbuck’s patient labor is to bring compromise and conciliation into the long standing feud of Science and Religion.”

The service of the psychology of religion to religion is indicated in the words of Professor Leuba: “Religion needs as much as any other practical activity the kind of purification and guidance that science provides. It needs in particular the insight into the dynamics of conscious life which can be contributed, not by studies in comparative religion nor by criticism of sacred texts, but only by psychology.”

The psychology of religion should lend information as to the origin and solution of such problems of the Christian Church as: the decay of the revival, alienation from the church of whole classes of the population, the excess of women over men in church life, the apparent powerlessness of organized religion to suppress or seriously check the great organized vices and injustices of society, the failure of the Sunday School to accomplish more definite results in the dissemination of Bible knowledge.¹¹

The psychology of religion will aid in applying the great truths of the Bible to life. Professor Bowne has suggested that “a great many things may be theologically true which are not psychologically true.” “We may express and explain the experience in terms of doctrine, and in doing so we may have the truth; nevertheless, the doctrine is not a fact of consciousness, but a

10 Warner, *op cit.*, p. 32.

11 Suggested by Coe in his “Spiritual Life.”

theory about the fact."¹² The great Bible doctrines must be interpreted in the light of human nature, and their application must be adapted to each individual. "Conversion" may be definitely stated as a theological formula but its meaning in experience varies with individuals. The psychology of religion ought to aid in a true interpretation of these fundamental conceptions of religion.

The study of the abnormal and the pathological in religion—for there are such instances—ought to lead to principles applicable in the securing of the normal in religious experience just as the study of physical disease has aided mankind to take precautionary steps to conserve health and the study of insanity has lead to information concerning the laws of mental health.

There are many practical results that should follow from the study of the psychology of religion that are of special value to the minister of the Gospel or the teacher of religion. Such a study ought to "increase our power of appreciation of spiritual things," as a scientific study of the flowers, the rocks, the stars increases appreciation of them. Such a study ought to strengthen the faith of the religious man for he sees the reality of religion for life, and is convinced above all else that man is a "religious being" and that he has religious needs that must be met.

The study of the psychology of religion should lead and is leading to greater wisdom in religious education. A recent inquiry of the Student Department of the Young Men's Christian Association shows that forty-five colleges offer required courses in Religious Education and that eighty have elective courses in it. These courses profess to be based largely upon a supposed knowledge of the psychology of religion and of child study. This study would give us sound pedagogical principles. "The service of psychology to practical religion is to make possible a harvest of wiser means in moral and religious culture, and also to lift religion sufficiently out of the domain of feeling to make an appeal to the understanding."

The study of the psychology of religion convinces one that there are different lines of religious development and growth. To be convinced of this leads one to adopt methods of work to

12 Bowne: *Studies in Christianity*, p. 199.

meet the needs and conditions of each individual. One great danger in the work of a religious teacher is to make "his experience a standard by which to judge and guide the experience of others." This has led to many mistakes in religious nurture and culture. To demand that each should 'come to the Lord' by the same road and through the same experience is unscientific, untrue to nature. This also suggests that there are stages of spiritual growth from childhood to maturity and the religious appeal and the spiritual food should be adapted to each stage. This study ought to equip the religious worker to realize "the importance of wisely anticipating the stages of growth and leading on naturally and easily from one stage to another." It will aid him to meet doubt, hesitation, and objection in a wise manner. It will add to his zeal knowledge, for neither zeal without knowledge nor knowledge without zeal will suffice.

Especially should a science such as the psychology of religion be of worth and value to the religious leader in the Lutheran Church which has always laid strong emphasis upon the religious training and the education of her children and youth, and upon methods that are now receiving the commendation of modern scientific thought. Lutheran pastors have had their attention called to, and their interest awakened in the relations of psychology to their work by the words of Dr. G. H. Gerderding in his volume "The Lutheran Catechist," especially in Chapter III, "The Catechist's Study of the Catechumen" and in Chapter XII, "The Catechist's Qualifications." In the latter chapter he writes: "The good catechist must know human nature. He needs to be a psychologist; to know not only general psychology, but even more does he need to know child-psychology..... This is very important and helpful for the understanding of the mental makeup, the mental activity and the mental development of child-nature..... He will find much that will help him in his catechising." We add, that the psychology of religion has the same bearing and important relation to the pastor's work as Dr. Gerberding ascribes to child psychology.

More recently, the attention of Lutheran pastors has been directed to this study by the Rev. Prof. Luther A. Weigle, Ph.D., who has placed emphasis upon this field of study in his volume, "The Pupil and the Teacher," (Book Two of the Lutheran Teacher Training Series) in which he acknowledges his indebt-

edness to such writers as Hall, James, and Coe, quoting directly from the latter's distinctively psychological treatise on religion, "The Spiritual Life."

Still more recently the Rev. Prof. Leander S. Keyser, D.D., has called the attention of Lutheran pastors to the relation of psychology to their work, in his volume, "A System of Christian Ethics." He has done some psychologizing in the field of religion touching upon 'conversion,' and 'the unfolding life of the regenerated child.'

The Lutheran method of catechization and confirmation offers a fruitful field for investigation and an excellent opportunity for the application of the approved methods of religious nurture.

Granting that religion is the highest concern of life; that the human soul is man's greatest possession, and its culture the greatest task assigned to man; it behooves the Lutheran minister in his threefold capacity of preacher, pastor, and catechist, to avail himself of the latest results of any science that will make him more efficient in the discharge of his duties, in the feeding of souls that are hungering and thirsting for righteousness.

North Liberty, Iowa.

ARTICLE V.

THOUGHTS ON SPINOZA AND HIS SYSTEM.

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

1. Prof Schlatter of the University of Tübingen, in his book "Philosophical Work Since Cartesius with Special Reference to its Ethical and Religious Results," asks the question: What is it that secured for Cartesianism such permanent influence? The system of Cartesius as such, he says, yielded no especially tangible results. Its best service was that it established a principle for the interpretation of nature. But here Newton did more than Cartesius. Prof. Schlatter says: The real credit for the permanent influence of Cartesianism in the history of philosophy belongs to two great men: to Spinoza with his great power of systematizing, and to Leibnitz who with the universality of his information summoned all human knowledge before the forum of a philosophical thinking that had been inspired by Cartesius, the father of modern philosophy. Schlatter remarks: The constellation of these three great men remind us of three great men in ancient philosophy: Socrates, the pioneer; Plato who coined the thought of his teacher and drew up the formulas; Aristotle, the universal observer who co-ordinated the vast material under the new viewpoint.

2. *What is the difference between Cartesius and Spinoza?* Cartesius had two substances, uncreated (God) and created (thought and extension). The created substance is dependent upon the uncreated, but thought and extension are independent the one of the other. Substance is defined as something that does not need anything outside of itself for existence. Spinoza retained that definition, but said: There is only one *substance*, God. Thought and extension are mere attributes of the divine being. What God really is cannot be expressed. He is, of course, eternal, infinite, free. But Spinoza is opposed to any description of what God is. *Omnis determinatio est negatio.* To describe the essence of God would be drawing this divine substance into the realm of the finite. The nearest we can come to

understanding and observing something of God is by turning to the *attributes* of the substance: thought and extension. These attributes represent to us what our mind is able to perceive of the eternal, infinite substance. It is thought in so far as our mind can think of God under the attribute of thought; it is extension in so far as our mind can observe God under the attribute of extension. The attributes, then, are something merely empirical. Back of them is the eternal, infinite, indefinable substance. . . . Within the attributes (thought and extension) Spinoza has the *modes* of his substance. Considered under the attributes of thought these modes are *ideas*; and considered under the attribute of extension they are *bodies*. These are the forms, the manifestations, the life of the eternal, the infinite substance. So, then, Spinoza is a *pantheist*; Cartesius was *theist*. Cartesius needed God (the idea dei) to arrive at the reliability of his thinking, as a safeguard against thoughts as mere illusions. And he needed God as an explanation of how thoughts and things come into motion. This Cartesian injection of God into the philosophical conception of nature has done a distinct service. It has given a check to and put off at least for a time the tendency of the philosophers of nature to conceive of nature as in conflict with the conception of a divine being in the theistic sense. The 17th and the 18th centuries have had a number of natural scientists who could believe in a personal God back of what they discovered of the mysteries in nature (Kepler, Linne, et al.) Not before the end of the 18th century, begins the conflict between science and theology. Here we are indebted to Cartesius even if we have to admit that after all he was not interested in God *for God's sake*, but simply needed the conception of a personal divine being as an *auxiliary link* to arrive logically at a conception of the world. But Spinoza is a *pantheist*. The distinction between God and world as an essential distinction goes. To appreciate what we have just said of a continued Cartesian influence upon the study of nature, it must be kept in mind that the philosophy of Spinoza (he died in 1677) did not generally begin to ferment the scientific world until about the end of the 18th century. Christian Europe could not so soon forget religious traditions and find itself at home in a monistic philosophy where

in oriental fashion¹ all individual being was to submerge and to disappear in the one general being. The time for Spinoza's philosophy was to come later. We have here touched upon the fundamental difference between Spinoza and Cartesius. And yet Spinoza was a Cartesian. He has in common with Cartesius the new conception of nature. His pantheism where all individual being loses its existence in the being of the All is a process of nature in harmony with the foundations upon which Cartesius had been building. Cushman says fittingly: "The philosophy of Spinoza seems to be Cartesian in every respect except one; and that one difference was like the leaven in the lump—it transformed his philosophy into a radically different one from that of Descartes. Spinoza's point of departure was the philosophy of Descartes, all his presuppositions are the fundamental principles of Descartes. But he added to these a new and transforming principle: he conceived that the substance, God, is not merely one object of knowledge, but *he is the only object of knowledge*. He is only substance, and finite things are only modifications of him. Finite things are alike at bottom, and to know them truly is to know God." Spinoza does away with the individual life of the personality. The Ego is to him no individual reality. Cartesius found the assurance of his own existence in the fact of his thinking; Spinoza predicates real existence to the substance only in which the individual things are contained as modes. Thoughts and things he compares to the moving waves upon the ocean. As the waves have no existence independent of the ocean so also the individual modes of thought and extension have no individual existence independent of the substance. The divine substance is free, that is it works according to its own all inclusive nature. But the individual beings (modes) are not free. Their manifestations and workings are determined by the manifold things with which together they form the substance.

3. *Some thoughts on Pantheism. Spinoza compared with Hegel.* Pantheism says: God is identical with the world. Not, of course with the isolated things of the world, but with the unity of the world, with the universe. We see God in the unity of material

1 Spinoza was, or had been, a Jew and received his first training through the synagogue which had never entirely gotten out of touch with traditions dating from a time when the mysteries of the Orient through Hellenistic channels joined hands with Judaism.

being, in the unity of intellectual being, in the unity of moral being.

There are mainly *two forms of Pantheism*: the oriental and the occidental. In two ways Pantheism can endeavor to conceive of the world as identical with God: either as an ever-the-same-remaining *substance* at the basis of all phenomena (oriental), or as an ever progressing *development* in all that is and occurs (occidental).

(a) The East is the world of stagnation. It remains ever the same. Strictly speaking there is or was, in the past, no historical development. There is no right of individuality. Our conceptions are so different. When a missionary has been killed we send warships. The orientals cannot understand this. According to their conception the individual has no right to exist against the interests of the whole. To the East the individual appearances are nothing but symptoms of the universal substance, like waves coming out of the ocean and again disappearing in the mass of waters. The universal substance is the only thing that really exists. The individual things are only form and mode of the existence of the universal substance. So God, the universal substance, is the only thing that really exists. The individual appearances are nothing but modes of the eternal substance. They have no real existence. The world does not really exist. Only in it we have a passing appearance of God. In this kind of Pantheism substance is in eternal repose and rest. So it has always been in the Orient. The most influential representative of this Pantheism in the West was Spinoza, by descent an oriental (Jew) himself.

(b). Related to the former, yet of an altogether different character, is occidental Pantheism. The West, in contrast with the East, is the world of movement, of history, of development, of growth. To occidental Pantheism the absolute is not the substance in repose, remaining ever the same, but it is development, the process of history, ever going on. Therefore here the absolute has no real existence. Only the world, in progress of development, has real existence. The most influential representative of this type of Pantheism is Hegel. According to his con-

ception the absolute, God, is constantly coming into existence in the process of development which is ever going on.²

In making such a distinction between oriental and occidental Pantheism it must, of course, not be expected that all presentations of Pantheism of Spinoza and Hegel will always be in either the one or the other of these two forms. In many, perhaps in most cases we will have more or less a combination of both. Yet, the creed which Goethe gives us in his Faust, for instance, is a pretty clear case of Spinozian Pantheism. And we know that for a long time the religious tenets of Spinoza's philosophy was to Goethe the religion in which he found satisfaction. Schelling, also a pantheist, in a famous poem of 1800, traces the absolute mind through all forms of life, through stone, tree, flower, and finally arrives at man in whom the mind finds itself ("in dem der Riesengeist sich selber findt.") And after the mind thus has found itself, has reached self-consciousness, it says to itself: "I am the God whom nature carries in its bosom, the Mind that moves the universe." Here we see Spinozian Pantheism on its way to Hegel. It is the doctrine that man is the end and aim of all expressions of life in the universe. Hegel, then, lifted this observation of development in the realm of nature a step higher, tracing the absolute mind through history until he sees it reaching its highest form of intelligence in the state. In the Hegelian observation historical development, movement, is the constant representation of the Absolute.³

4. *Thoughts on Pantheism continued...Critical review.*

A. What can we say in favor of Pantheism?

(a). *It has aided us in the study of nature.* We have learned to see more the unity and the relation of things in nature. We appreciate the laws in the individual phenomena.

(b). *Hegel's Pantheism in particular has had a great influence on the study of history.* Before Hegel, the historian saw but isolated historical facts which he at best succeeded in explaining by a so-called pragmatism of individual motives. But Hegel taught us to see in all historical development the rule of

² This characterization of the two types of Pantheism is in the main an extract from a chapter in Luthardt's last work on Dogmatics in the form in which I had inserted it in my lectures on Dogmatics before the students in Hamma Divinity School (semester 1910-11).

³ Compare Luthardt on this subject.

an objective and universal reason. The representatives of development in history are not altogether independently the makers of history, but in the realization of their ideas they are in the service of a higher reason. Napoleon, for instance, was in God's hand the scourge for Europe and the instrument in bringing about a regeneration of Prussia which was destined to create a united Germany, totally the reverse of what Napoleon aimed at. The battle of Jena made the battle of Sedan possible. Before Hegel, history always was written in this way: There once was a man who did so and so. Yet while we here admit a valuable contribution by Pantheism to the study of history we must at the same time warn against an exaggeration of the conception mentioned. True, the individuals are parts of a whole and do serve the whole more than they themselves sometimes know and wish to. But, on the other hand, the individual engaged in the making of history is not "a mere figure in an arithmetical problem"; he acts with personal responsibility, because he is a moral being. Napoleon cannot disclaim responsibility for the blood he spilt in his many unjust wars.

B. But the pantheistic conception of God is impossible:

(a). *The reason* which we see in the universe, in the phenomena, is not God himself, but something from God. It is his laws, his order, his relations. But back of it is he himself as a personal God. Pantheism fails to press through from the effect to the cause, from the laws to the one who established them, from the order in the universe to the one from whom it originated.

(b). In Spinoza's Pantheism there is *no personal God*, but it cannot be denied that his "substance" has real existence. In Hegel's Pantheism the so-called "absolute" has no real existence. The absolute is always only on the way to become real, but never reaches that end. At least not in the sense that it is a completed process. One phenomenon is wiped out of existence to make room for another. Hegel himself calls history a place of skulls. So death is really the God of Pantheism, because it is by death and going out of existence that this process in history manifests himself. We can see how easily Pantheism can develop into materialism. Feuerbach, the materialist, in a poem, has glorified death as the real God in whom all forms of life constantly disappear as germs for a new life.

(c). In Pantheism there is *no real sin*. If everything that

is done is done with necessity, if what occurs is simply the realization of the absolute; then there is no difference between good and bad, right and wrong, no occasion for approval and disapproval. So Pantheism is in conflict with our conscience.

(d). There can also be *no personal relation between God and man*. The absolute, or substance is not personal. So there can be no prayer. A lecturer in a summer school, a few years ago, Mr. French, introduced to us in a stereopticon view, a Japanese lady sitting in a park and gazing at flowers. He told us that it was her morning worship, and that it was foolish for us to desire to bring another religion to the Japanese. But what a mistake. There can be no real religious communion between us and the leaf, the flower, the birds and the rays of the sun. Also, with respect to Hegel, we cannot worship the representations of "absolute" reason in the developments of history. The religion of Pantheism is nothing but sentiment, a vague feeling that may come over man when he meditates over the harmonies and disharmonies in the universe. True religion is something altogether different: it is an active attitude of faith and hope, a personal relation to a personal God. Our religious consciousness in the depths of its movements tells us that God is not an indefinite something, but one to whom we can pray: Give us this day our daily bread, forgive us our trespasses. God is a self as we are, but with the difference that he as the Eternal has the cause in himself. But since the days of Spinoza we have the continuous objection: an absolute person is a contradiction to itself. A person that says "I" necessarily limits himself to the thing outside of himself; but absoluteness excludes all limitations. If God is person then he is not absolute, and if he is absolute then he is no person. And so they say, it is much higher and more dignified not to speak of God as a person, because it makes him finite, it limits him. But is this correct? The idea of fitness attaches to personality only among human beings. It is true, we as human beings can find the consciousness of ourselves only by differentiating our "I" from the "non-I," but it is different with the Eternal. And then consider this: the complete conception of the absolute *demands* the idea of personality. Why should God be lower than the highest of his creatures? Personal being is the highest form of existence, all being is a climax up to personality.

(e). And, finally, *Pantheism does away with personal immortality*. What the pantheists call immortality, namely that at death the individual will re-unite with the eternal substance (Spinoza), with the world-soul (Giordano Bruno), with the absolute mind (Hegel) affords no comfort to him who has believed and hoped and loved according to the Scriptures. Nothing short of the belief in *personal immortality*, in a personal identity in the other world will satisfy the hope of man's soul which, as says the church-father Tertullian, is by nature a Christian ("anima humana naturaliter Christiana est").

5. *Thoughts on Spinoza in illustration of his Pantheism.*

(a). *Relation of God to the World.* There is no opposition between the two. They are one. God as substance is the ultimate ground; in the world of thought and extension we have the phenomena. God is the sum-total of existent things (of the modes) and at the same time their immanent and energizing principle. The world is in God. What made Spinoza so attractive to poets like Lessing and Goethe was his thought of the unity of all being. How fascinating this thought was to the Italian philosopher Bruno! Thinkers not guided by revelation, who are not theologians, will always be much attracted by a philosophy of idealistic monism.

(b). *No anthropomorphic conceptions of God.* Even thinking and willing, according to Spinoza, should not be predicated of God. It would conflict with his infinity. From Eucken: "Moreover, it is impossible that God should make the welfare of man his chief concern, arranging everything for his special end, and, maybe, rewarding and punishing man according to his deserts. The world pursues its own course. Good and evil fortune visit alike the just and the unjust. All purposive action is unworthy of God. He wishes for nothing outside himself. His infinite being is from everlasting to everlasting at rest in itself alone." Spinoza here aims at freeing the conception of God from all human limitations. But his thoughts are at the same time a denial of divine providence as we, guided by revelation, have been taught to understand it.⁴ The earthquake that destroyed Lisbon, of which Goethe tells in his autobiography, led many to accept as truth this philosophy of Spinoza.

⁴ Rand, Spinoza's Ethics, p. 165.

(c). *The problem of interaction between mind and matter* (or thought and extension, the two attributes of infinite substance). Cartesius had here left an impassable gulf. Spinoza also does not remove this dualism, but he shifts it from the real to the phenomenal. Eucken: "For him matter and mind are not different things, but only different aspects of one and the same thing, only developments, presentations, existential manifestations of one and the same fundamental substance. Each series runs its own course in complete independence of the other, without any interaction or mutual disturbance. But they are both in complete agreement, since the event is in essence one and the same, whether it fall into the one series or the other." Between both of these sides (mind and matter, thought and extension), although essentially different, there is a complete harmony, a constant parallelism. With every movement of mind there goes a corresponding movement of matter. Both sides will always be together like object and subject. In this manner Spinoza established even here the unity of being. It was at this point that the philosophy that came after Spinoza refused to accept such solution of the Cartesian problem and then developed the two branches which opposed each other up to the time when Kant proposed a new solution: Hobbes and Locke insisting upon the superiority of matter (realism), and Leibniz, and especially Berkeley, advocating the superiority of mind (idealism).

(d). *How does man appear in this system of Pantheism?* He is just a mode in the infinite universe. His existence is only a single incident. His body just a part of infinite extension, his spirit a part of infinite thought. In this connection with the whole he has no freedom of action. Even though he seems to act with free will, his acts are only the products of animated mechanism. In our consciousness of freedom, we simply deceive ourselves. We are ignorant of the causes of our actions, and therefore they seem to us as acts of our own free will, but they are in fact nothing but parts of a natural unit. This was certainly not progressive. Antiquity had believed in man being subject to the power of fate, but Christianity had undertaken to lift man from the dominion of fate into the realm of freedom.⁵

(e). *A feature of Spinozian ethics.* The leading principle

5 Compare Rand, Spinoza's Ethics, p. 164.

of man's acts is self-preservation. "The more capable man is the more energetically he will strive for his own advantage." So then what theologians have called the fundamental form of sin, namely selfishness, appears here justified as the normal, yea as something that flows with inner necessity out of the divine substance. It is natural and right to hate our enemies. Also to love our friends merely because they promote our wellbeing. No law is needed here to convince us of a shortcoming. Spinoza regarded repentance as weakness.

(f). *Another characteristic point in Spinoza's ethics* we have in the following two sentences which we read in the fifth part of his "Ethics": (1) "The mind has greater power over the emotions and is less subject thereto, in so far as it understands all things as necessary." And (2) "An emotion, which is a passion, ceases to be a passion, as soon as we form a clear and distinct idea thereof."⁶ Passions are treated as confused ideas, inadequate ideas of things. The virtuous man will strive after adequate ideas, after knowledge of God as the first cause of all things. This will lead him to the *amor Dei intellectualis* which secures for him the equilibrium of mind in which he enjoys real happiness.

Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

⁶ Rand, pp. 183 & 182.

ARTICLE VI.

THE CONFESIONAL PRINCIPLES OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH.

BY J. C. JACOBY, D.D.

The Lutheran Church is the mother of modern confessions. She was born with a confession upon her lips. She has never been ashamed to confess her doctrinal beliefs as she has found them in the Word of God. And her founder and leaders have always been careful to express in her doctrinal propaganda only essential and fundamental truths. Hence her history has been a rallying point around which all other denominations have been focusing their confessions. The reason for all this is found in the fact that she has clung closely to the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. In speaking of this fact Dr. C. P. Krauth has well said, "The Holy Scriptures are a perfect rule of faith, because they are such they beget a true faith in the heart which receives them aright. The faith thus begotten instinctively expresses itself in words." In this great (shall I say this divine) idea, Lutheran Confessions have been conceived, and from it born, and then nurtured by the Mother of Protestantism. We note with pride the fact that historically the Augsburg Confession is the oldest among Protestant confessions. And be it said to the honor and credit of the Lutheran Church that it has the only confession which has never been authoritatively revised, altered or amended since its adoption by the Lutheran Reformers in 1530. As a confession it has stood as an expression of a living faith in God as taught in His Word. Nay, more than that, the larger truths and more fundamental doctrines set forth in the Augsburg Confession became fundamental in all other great denominational confessions. Its fundamental conceptions of truth have been simply redressed in other language.

While Melanchthon had much to do with the composition and arrangement of the Augsburg Confession, Luther was in a real sense the author of it. In the language of Dr. C. P. Krauth, (Augsburg Confession, p. 8) "To a large extent Melanchthon's

work is but an elaboration of Luther's and to a large extent it is not an elaboration, *but a reproduction.*" To Luther belonged the doctrinal thought of the confession, its inmost life and spirit, and to Melanchthon its matchless form. Both are, therefore, in a sense its authors, but the most essential elements of it are Luther's.* * who was the author of Melanchthon's theological life; he was, as Melanchthon loved to call him, "his most dear father."

With these few prefatory thoughts let us note the following fundamental conceptions or ideas as vital principles in our Lutheran confessions.

I. There must be an infallible basis on which to safely ground a confession of faith.

Luther as the hero of Protestantism took his stand with the Bible as the "*only infallible rule of faith and practice.*" This idea was the occasion of the first and the gravest conflict between him and the Romish Church. Any other ground for a confession would have been unprotestant and essentially Romanizing; for both the Greek and the Roman Churches regard the Bible and tradition as co-ordinate sources of truth and rules of faith. But with Luther and his followers it was the Bible pre-eminently and all the time. He spoke of the Scriptures as "The Book given of God, by the Holy Spirit, to His Church." And without any discrimination, he spoke of it as a whole, and so used it, as his rule of faith and practice. He used the expressions, "The Scriptures," and, "The Word of God," as synonymous. With him the Word of God was exalted above every human society or office. He maintained that the Church was "begotten of the Gospel and subject to it," for, says he, "The Church does not make the Word, but is made by it." From this position, in opposition to the Papal conception, he is not induced to retreat a single step by his desire to maintain against the fanatics the objective validity of the Scriptures. Great as is the importance which he attaches, for the awakening of faith, to the impression made by the harmonious testimony of the Church, yet the only real basis for faith is to be found for each individual in the fact that it is "The Word of God, and that he inwardly perceives that it is the truth, and would do so though an angel from heaven and all the world should preach against it." (*Theol. of Luther*, Vol. II, 224.)

Luther everywhere assumed as a fact beyond all question that it is the Word of God, by which divine truth and the blessings of

salvation are to be imparted to men, by which faith is to be awakened, and the new life cultivated. It was in the light of this conception of the Word that Luther so firmly maintained that salvation can be attained only in Christ, and upon the ground of His atonement, and of the unity of the two natures in His person, thus denying the infallibility of the Pope, and the authority and power of the Priest. And in this profound truth likewise is grounded his conception of infant baptism as related to infant salvation, as also the doctrine of the "Real Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper."

II. There must be a clear conception of the fundamental truths of the Bible in which to ground such faith.

That Luther was, in a sense, moved as by inspiration to grasp the great truths of the Bible, to distinguish the essential from the non-essential, can hardly be questioned. Somehow visions of the salient points of salvation, as revealed in the Scriptures, seemed to burst in upon his mind with such clear conceptions that little or no modifications later became necessary. The Romish Church had kept her laity in darkness so long that to Luther fell the lot to rend the veil and let in the light. Luther possessed a clear conception of the fundamental doctrines of the Bible, and was gifted with the power of expressing them in language so as to bring them easily within the comprehension of the common people. As if by divine call he felt it his duty, not simply for his own personal spiritual culture and welfare to get into the light, but also to lead the common people into the light of God's Word. With him it was not what are my own predilections and conceptions of these things, but "what saith the Word of God," and "how can I make it clear to my countrymen and to the world?" These were vital questions with him. Hence he declared in his sermon on the interpretation of the Scriptures that no one could try to lead the people according to his own feelings or conceptions, but according to the Scriptures. His sole concern was such an apprehension and knowledge of the Scriptures as would touch their inner natures and move them to repentance, instead of to servile penance; and to faith in Jesus Christ as a personal Saviour instead of a life of work-righteousness. He would have them grasp even the essentials of salvation in such a clear manner as to bring about a deeper spiritual experience. To study the deeper and more essential truths and dogmas of the Bible,

not so much for the letter as for the spirit, was Luther's great concern. He declared, "Preach one thing, namely, the wisdom of the cross * * * for by such preaching of the cross will man learn to distrust himself and to hope in Christ." (*Theol. of Luth.* Vol. I. p. 125-6) And later in a sermon on the incarnation of Christ (*Christ as the Word of God*, John 1:1) he set forth in the most unmistakable terms the importance of a clear conception of the nature of Christ as the Son of God and of man as fundamental in the Christian faith and life. "The Word as here used," he declared, "is the personification of the wisdom of God in revelation and becomes a fundamental factor in the Christian faith and life." And we dare not forget that while Luther was thus aspiring to light for himself and his people, he was at the same time keenly aware of the abuses imposed upon the people by the Romish church. The cup of iniquity in the Roman Catholic church was filling as rapidly to the brim as Luther's mind and heart were filling with the truth of revelation and the spiritual power of an inner life. The last drop in this cup of iniquity was Tetzel's sale of indulgences, and Luther's hand was destined and ready to dash it to the ground. The thirty-first day of October, 1517, dawned only to become memorable in history by nailing his famous ninety-five theses to the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg. Three great ideas or principles occupied the Reformer's mind as the ground-work of these theses:

1. The first was the fundamental doctrine, namely, "The doctrine of justification by faith."
2. The second was a simple but sublime truth, namely, "The Supreme Authority of The Scriptures."
3. The third was a profound principle of religion, namely, "The Right of Private Judgement."

The first was a vital principle in the divine plan of redemption by Jesus Christ. The second was equally vital, since without a devout recognition of the supreme authority of the Scriptures man could not rightly apprehend Christ and appropriate His saving grace. And no less vital was the third in that "The Right of Private Judgement" released man from the yoke of the priesthood, and gave him liberty in Jesus Christ as the One Great High Priest. In short, "Religious Liberty," became the mighty inspiration which was destined to march in triumph over battle-fields, and give dignity and power to the people, and to lead to

the reception of great truths obscured by priests for a thousand years. It became the motive of an irresistible progress, in the course of which God reared Calvin to emancipate Switzerland and to illuminate France. It moved a Latimer to plant England with Puritans, and a John Knox to awaken Christian heroes in Scotland, and at length brought to this great land a band of Christian colonists as the nucleus of a new nation. These vital principles publicly confessed and proclaimed were the power with which God was moving His people under the leadership of a great reformer.

III. Such conceptions of fundamental principles clearly expressed are the only means by which to maintain unity and order in a religious body.

The Lutheran Church has been most fortunate in the clear expression of vital doctrines and principles in her confession of faith. The Augsburg Confession is the only one of all Protestant confessions which has stood the test of the most drastic criticisms for nearly four centuries. Moreover her fundamental doctrines have, from the first, been the great bulwark behind which all other Protestant confessions have taken refuge. To this point Gieseler, the Reformed Church historian, said, "If the question be, which, among all Protestant confessions, is best adapted for forming the foundation of a union among Protestant Churches, we declare ourselves unreservedly for the Augsburg Confession." Her confessional basis is Scriptural in principle, profound in doctrinal setting, logical in arrangement, and inspiring in the intensely religious spirit which permeates it.

The Augsburg Confession in its structure bears evident marks of growth in its conception and formation. Mature minds wrought slowly, thoughtfully, prayerfully, as God gave them light. Fundamental truths clearly expressed was the one great aim of both Luther and Melanchthon.

A careful analysis of the Augsburg Confession shows that the articles were not arranged as a whole with reference to a system, but may be classified as follows: (See *Introduct. to Augsb. Conf.* by Krauth, p. 48).

1. *The confessedly Catholic*, or universal Christian Articles, those which Christendom, Greek and Roman, have confessed, especially in the Apostle's and Nicene creeds. These were the doctrines of the Trinity (I), the Incarnation (III), the second

coming of Christ, the general resurrection, the eternity of rewards and punishments (XVII), the validity of administration by unworthy ministers, (VIII), the offer of grace in baptism, and the right of children to it (IX), civil government (XVI), free will (XVIII), and the cause of sin (XIX).

2. *The Protestant articles*—those opposed to the errors in doctrine, and the abuses in usage, of the Papal part of the Church of the West. To this the confession, in its whole argument, based upon the Holy Scriptures as a supreme rule of faith was opposed. But more particularly to the Pelagianism of Rome, in the doctrine of original sin (Art. II); its corruption of the doctrine of Justification (Art IV); its doctrine of merits in works (Art. VI, XX); of the ministerial office, as an order of priests (Art. V); of transubstantiation (Art. X); of Auricular Confession (Art. XI); of repentance (Art. XIII); of the opus operatum in sacraments (Art. XIII); of church order (Art. XX); of the very nature of the Christian church (Art. VII); and of the worship of saints (Art. XXI).

3. *The Evangelical articles*, or parts of articles—those articles which especially assert the doctrines which are connected most directly with the Gospel in its essential character as tidings of redemption to lost man and the great doctrine of grace. These articles are especially those which teach the fall of man, the radical corruption of his nature, his exposure to eternal death, and the absolute necessity of regeneration (Art. II); The atonement of Christ, and the saving work of the Holy Spirit (Art. III); Justification by faith alone (Art. IV); the true character of repentance, or conversion (Art. XII); and the importance of man's own will to effect it (XVIII).

4. *The articles which set forth distinctive Biblical doctrines*, which the Lutheran Church holds in peculiar purity, over against the corruptions of Romanism, the extravagance of radicalism, the perversions of rationalism, or the imperfect development of theology. Such are the doctrines of the proper inseparability of the two natures of Christ (Art. III); the objective force of the Word and sacraments (Art. V); the reality of the presence of both the heavenly and earthly elements in the Lord's Supper (Art. X); the true value of private, that is, individual absolution (Art. XI); the genuine character of sacramental grace (Art. XIII); The true medium in regard to the rites of the

Church (Art. XV); and the freedom of the will (XVIII); and the proper doctrine concerning the cause of sin (Art. XIX).

On all these points the Augsburg Confession presents views which, either in matter or measure, are opposed to extremes, which claim to be Protestant and evangelical. Pelagianizing, rationalistic, fatalistic, fanatical, unhistorical tendencies, which, more or less unconsciously, have revealed themselves, both in Romanism, and in various types of nominally evangelical protestantism, are all met and condemned by the letter, tenor, or spirit of these articles. And with all, these profound truths and doctrines are expressed in language so clear and unmistakeable as to come into ready apprehension of the common people. And, in the language of Krauth, "With the Augsburg Confession begins the clearly recognized life of the Evangelical Protestant Church, the purified Church of the West, on which her enemies fixed the name Lutheran. With this confession her most self sacrificing struggles and greatest achievements are connected. It is hallowed by the prayers of Luther, among the most ardent that ever burst from the human heart; it is made sacred by the tears of Melanchthon, among the tenderest which ever fell from the eyes of man. It is embalmed in the living, dying, and undying devotion of the long line of the heroes of our faith, who, through the world which was not worthy of them, passed to their eternal rest. The greatest masters in the realm of intellect have defended it with their labours; the greatest princes have protected it from the sword by the sword; and the blood of its martyrs, speaking better things than vengeance, pleads forever, with the blood of Him whose all-availing love, whose sole and all-toning sacrifice, is the beginning, middle and end of its witness."

Such are some of the Confessional Principles of the grand old historic Lutheran Church.

Wellington, Kansas.

ARTICLE VII.

WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH THE PHILOSOPHY OF
RUDOLPH EUCKEN?

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, D.D., PH.D. (LEIPZIG).

Among present-day leaders of thought Rudolph Eucken, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Jena, bulks largely. He has lectured to students for many years, and is now an old man with a shock of white hair, a ruddy face and virility in every movement. About two decades ago he began to write, putting out in book form his views of life. At first these writings made but a passing impression, for there is much philosophy in Germany. Besides, Eucken had left the beaten paths and urged a philosophy which touched individual life. So men called him the "preacher philosopher" and smiled a superior smile. But Eucken kept on thinking and writing. He was invited to this country by Yale University. Even then being little known, he was little spoken of. However, within a very few years Eucken's writings have begun to be translated into English by student admirers of his from Oxford and other British centers. Recently Prof. Eucken has come to this country under the auspices of Harvard. To-day in all circles of religious and higher thought, in Germany, England and America, Eucken is the subject of earnest thinking and even sharp discussion. Like Luther in this respect at least, Eucken has attracted to his university, students from all sections of the world.

"They flock," says Herman, an admirer of his, "from all quarters of the earth, even as remote as Iceland, to sit at the feet of the man whose idealism not only serves as a rallying ground for all who are engaged in the struggle for a concrete spiritual experience, but finds expression in a singularly attractive and benevolent personality, whose influence reinforces its teaching in a characteristic and indelible way."

In 1900 he received the Nobel prize as the author of the most admirable literary work of the year. Unquestionably, then, we must reckon with the views which this remarkable man is putting forth.

What shall we do then with the philosophy of Rudolph Eucken?—At least this: look fairly into it; neither on the one hand shrinking from it because it has a new nomenclature, new avenues of approach to life, nor on the other hand rushing pell mell into it with an undue precipitancy, laying our hearts and chaplets at the feet of an unknown god.

The moral purpose of Eucken comes to the surface when one hears him lecture. Dr. Slosson says, "You might take him for a great evangelist and you would not be wrong if you did. His voice rings out loud and clear. He is tremendously in earnest, and throws himself forward on the reading desk as though to really reach his auditors, flinging out his hands as if to actually grasp 'das Geistesleben' with which his heart is overflowing and to spread it out far out over a materialistic and indifferent generation."

The titles of his books bear the same sort of witness to his earnestness in that he gives himself not to matter merely academic, but to that which has soul stuff in it. For instance he has written, giving the titles in English, "The Main Currents of Spiritual Thinking," 1904; "Introduction to Investigations on the Unity of the Spiritual Life," 1885; "The Unity of Life of the Spirit in the Consciousness and in the Actions of Humanity," 1886; "The Problem of Human Life," 1901; "The Struggle for the Spiritual Content of Life," 1896; "The Truth of Religion," 1901; "The Nature of Religion," 1901; "Thomas Aquinas and Kant, a Struggle of Two Worlds," 1901; "Outlines of a New View of Life, or Life's Bases and Life's Ideal," 1911; "The Chief Problems of the Philosophy of Religion," 1907; "The Meaning and Value of Life," 1908; "The Life of the Spirit," 1908; "Christianity and the New Idealism," 1910; "Religion and Life," 1911; "Können wir noch Christen sein?" ("May We Yet be Christians"), 1911.

How earnest these titles sound. And they are earnest. This is another ground why men are discussing the Philosophy of Eucken. He is a philosopher of life really in dead earnest and showing in addition a native competency of thought above most of his fellow craftsmen. Just now his nearest rival for public favor is Bergson, who also is earnest, and struggling with the universal problem of life.

Now that we find the personality of Eucken engaging and in

his books earnest thinking, we are the more attracted to know what it is he teaches. The answer is: The "Activistic Philosophy." For in a nutshell this is the distinguishing title of Prof. Eucken's philosophy; as Schopenhauer's was the philosophy of Pessimism, Von Hartman's the Philosophy of the Unconscious, Hegel's the Philosophy of Becoming; Leibnitz's the Philosophy of Monism, James' the Philosophy of Pragmatism, Comte's the Philosophy of Positivism, and Nietzsche's the Philosophy of Individualism, so Eucken's is the Philosophy of "Activism." This is what he calls it. What is it? Eucken says that there are many voices and discordant to-day in the thinking circles of men. These dissonant voices show the need of getting a deep solution of life, so deep as to reach beneath all differences and find the harmony which will explain them all.

What are these voices when they are classified? They are five. Five types of mind. First: a traditionalized religious type. This is the man who has inherited his Christianity. The chief element of this religious type Eucken thinks is a call to a renunciation. But the modern man, he believes, has broadened interests, a keener realization of life and is not and should not be weaned away from life's interests as in an age when men were "world weary."

The second type is that of so-called idealism. This type believes the true good of life is essentially a spiritual good. But it conceives, and indeed is interested in no Supreme out of the world and greater than the World being. Its surface weakness is that it can appeal only to the favored few. To it God with us is a mere abstraction.

Third is the materialistic type. Here we find a group of men who discard all else and count human life a mere natural development and a development from nature. God and good are lost in the shuffle and struggle. Man is and uses only the material. But this Eucken is sure gives no satisfaction: in the long run allows men no proper science. It puts only the brutal fight for existence in the place of joy, hope, love, self-sacrifice and friendship.

The fourth type of men, according to Eucken, is the Socialistic. It explains everything by social relations. All is resolved into environment, heredity and the like, and all is regenerated when society is reconstructed. It is of value, great value. But

unduly exaggerated. Back of society is and must be the individual and his personality.

The fifth type is the individualistic. Here everything is made to depend on the individual. Nietszche is the illustration. All things are alike lawful for the individualist. He is a law to himself. Whatever hampers him, he avoids; whatever attracts him, he tastes. The life of soul and spirit are each alike to him. But such a man is the slave of the moment, a reed shaken by the wind. Such a man has no "self-forgetting" love and is incapable of larger life towards self, towards man his brother, and of course not towards God. He has no relation to the Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief.

Here we are in a world, thinks Eucken, of these types. What shall we do? How unify them? How supplement the one-sided Naturalism, or Socialism, or Individualism? Nay, how shall we supersede them?

Everywhere, he thinks, the trend is towards them. Kant said we could not know the "thing in itself." But our present every-day philosophers are leading them all by their so-called "realities"—their "golden calves," and like the cohorts of Nebuchadnezzar they fall down and worship. But Eucken refuses. He will not gain the whole world and lose his own soul.

Here he finds his challenge to aid society towards a spiritual life—a spiritual life which he believes can be understood and justified to men. We do not need a theory of the universe. "We need behind the soulless culture of today a new movement of the spiritual life, a deeper life movement."¹

We are in a world—two worlds, the visible and invisible. We know material things through the avenues of sense. We handle, invent and learn natural law. But there is for Eucken also and first and last of all an invisible world—one not to be invested or investigated by things seen. It is the world of joy and sorrow, of love and conscience.

How do we find this world? By "Activism." This world we enter by experience alone. We know love by loving, joy by enjoying. We can see it in a picture—but its reality is only to those who enter in—there is life by living. So the spiritual world—to know it we must live and live in it. One cannot love

¹ *Expository Times*, London, March 1912, p. 252.

by thinking—one can only love by loving. Life is a series of adventures. The child walks—by stepping. Our first stroke in swimming is the same. We adventure—and then comes the exhilaration of it. So the steps of spiritual living, know by doing. If you do His will ye shall know of the doctrine.

Truth then is life. So spiritual truth can never be obtained by a mere life of passive contemplation. The recluse shuts himself out. Our age with its joys and temptations must be thrust into to get the life of it and to get the sense of life.

"Man," says Eucken, "does not originate spiritual life, but he is capable of attaining a participation in it." The life of the Spirit does not originate in Nature—it is personal. We must be born again, is His stern cry to a sluggish and unspiritual age. We choose and link ourselves to ultimate realities. We do not any longer carry our task alone. We see ourselves one with Him, and we become part of a "Universal Religion." We are now rich. This is a conversion. But other conflicts arise in the soul after its initial experience. Nature ignores our personal spiritual interests and drives her chariot over the Christ of God. The spiritual struggle has its Armageddon.

Here a new "realm of inwardness" opens. We enter in a second time. It is a spiritual life. We find dispositions, intentions, love. These are nothing in themselves but words, if they are not relations of our life with God. Eucken will have none of the Rationalist. He finds the core of things in a spiritual life. In this we agree. Neither will he be a mystic. He feels the spiritual life is won and nurtured by a living active entering in. In this too we agree.

I am glad to say that Eucken is no Pragmatist. He sees its shallowness. Life and reality are to him independent of and superior to their uses.

Now, as we have seen, this so-called "Activism" of Eucken has at least many definite Christian implications. Here there is room for a God active for us in the cross, and here too there is room for justification by faith, man's active assent to the satisfaction of the cross. But Eucken himself unfortunately does not enter into that room.

Having now glimpsed the path of Eucken's thought and traced some chief threads in his philosophy of the spiritual life, we are ready to take note of the elements in it which commend them-

selves to us as Evangelical Christians. Are there such points of contact and affirmation? There undoubtedly are. And they are great gain, and in no wise minimized by the negations which we later will have to face.

First, then, it must be a source of undiluted satisfaction to thinking Christian men that we have a philosopher of world distinction to-day to whom a system is not so good a thing as man created in the image of God. In Germany they have for years in a rather contemptuous way dubbed Eucken a "preacher." He never seemed to blush or be ashamed, for he was and is interested in men. This is no common gain. For philosophers have not been ever noted for deep moral interest for men.

A second thing which strikes one in Eucken's philosophy is his grip on the spiritual life. Forgetting for the moment his methods of reaching his goal, we must greatly value the aim and purpose of Eucken, which is to rekindle on the cold ashes of the materialistic hearth a warm and cheering blaze of life. He could cordially harmonize with us

" 'Tis life not death for which we pant,
More life and fuller than we want."

In his own home in Jena over the coffee cups he said to the writer: "I want cultured Germany, which has in large circles deserted Christ and the Church, to be brought back again. I want men of culture and thought to know that they can be Christians and ought to be. I want to aid with all my might in turning the streams of the present hostile thinking back to the cradle of Christianity again." And his face glowed as he said it, and his voice tingled with fervor, as it came to me, across the tables in his simple Jena home. That was ten years ago. And he has changed real currents of life since then—in many lands. Think too, that he has persistently done this in the same faculty with the most notorious materialist in Europe among educational circles, the creator of the Monistenbund and the defamer of Christianity—Prof. Ernst Haeckel, the Jena biologist. Eucken has lived and worked with Haeckel all these years and remained true to his own idealism of the spiritual life, though for much of that time Haeckel was applauded and Eucken the voice of one crying in a desert. Eucken agrees with Haeckel in this one thing—

both condemn the union of Church and State. But for widely different reasons. Haeckel because the Church thus receives artificial aid, Eucken because the Church is thus hampered in its freedom of development. In this case we can well agree with both.

Everywhere Eucken draws in vivid colors the supremacy of the spirit life first. It is not a mere intellectual exercise with him. He sees the spirit life first. If to many the theory of evolution has led to a real identification of man and nature, he still insists that for him we are and must be more than nature. He says:

"A consideration of all the facts leads us to the result that a life consisting solely of nature and intelligence involves an intolerable inconsistency."

In working out how man may attain his salvation, Eucken arrives at positions paralleling Scripture truth. He is, I think, willing to acknowledge that in his volition man does not apprehend God, but is apprehended of God. He says, "It is necessary to acknowledge that in all the spiritual movement which appears in the domain of man there is a revelation of the spiritual world, and as merely human power cannot lead the whole to new heights, in all development of the spiritual life the communication of the new world must precede the activities of man." Even in his deviations from the conceptions of historic Christianity, and he does deviate, as we shall see, he yet holds to historic molds of thought—with a fine sense of the futile weakness of the individual Christian who keeps himself apart from the Church as it is organized. He says in "Christianity and the New Idealism"—"A religion is not a mere theory concerning things human and divine. It discloses ultimate revelations of the spiritual life. He who would cut himself off from this great stream of experience inward as well as outward will soon find out how little the isolated individual can do in matters of this kind. It is easy to find fault with what tradition hands down. No less easy to draw up vague views of one's own. But how immense is the distance which separates procedure such as this from the creative effort which urges its sure way forward and which embraces all men's lives and exercises an elemental compulsion on us all."²

Or take his general insistence on religion. Prof. Slosson says:

² Christianity and the New Idealism, p. 146.

"Eucken is conciliatory, but no compromiser. He does not solicit for religion an humble place in modern life, by using arguments like those employed in the sale of patent medicines—that it is innocuous at the least and may sometimes do some good. He meets modern science upon her own ground. He claims for religion an equal practicability and efficiency; he demands for it a greater certitude and he is willing as Jesus was willing to put it to pragmatic test."³ Says Eucken in proof of this:

"Since we have found that religion is linked thus clearly with the whole, we need not make any timid compromise with certain superficial contemporary movements and so content ourselves with a lower degree of certainties, saying for instance that we can never altogether eliminate the objective element and that religious truths can never have the certainty of such formulae as $2 \times 2 = 4$. On the contrary, we maintain that it is a very poor conception of religion which deems any certainties superior to hers and does not claim for her truth a far more primary certainty than that of the formula $2 \times 2 = 4$. Only a shallow and perverse conception of truth can allow the certainties of the part to exceed the certainty of the whole. Either religion is merely a product of human works and ideas under the sanction of tradition and sacred convention and then neither art nor cunning can prevent so frail a fabric from being overwhelmed by the advancing spiritual tide; or else religion is based on facts of a superhuman order and in that case the most violent onslaught cannot shake her. Rather will it help her in the end through all the stress and toil of human circumstances to discover where her true strength lies and to express in purer ways the eternal truth that is in her heart."

Eucken distinguishes in his epistemological development, as already noticed, two forms of religion, the "Universal" and the "Characteristic." The first his "Universal" is a new mood within a man, a new step up in an old world. The second his "Characteristic" is the winning of a new world, a recognition of God who penetrates the spirit of man with redeeming power. In this double development Eucken insists on the value of the Church. There must be a *κοινωνία*, a holy assembly. In it there must be teachers with convictions. Here he joins the orthodox

³ *Independent*, Feb. 27, 146.

party in the recent discussion in Germany. In fact, he has never allied himself with the liberal Church party. He is not a member of the Protestantverein, the liberal organization, nor was he an upholder of Jatho, the deposed and very recently deceased Rhenish pastor. He recently said in an interview: "Much of the present-day liberalism suffers from superficiality. Its sense of the dark things of life, especially of the problem of guilt, is frequently too trivial to cope with the situation, and it lacks the self-sacrificing spirit which marked the old orthodoxy."

Finally Eucken insists on a union of the human and divine and therefore on a Christianity. "It, Christian truth, was the first to bring the pure inwardness of the soul to a clearer expression, but it has also, through the linking of the human to the divine order, raised life beyond the petty human." We have a philosophy here and a philosophy unsatisfied with grovelling in the dust and wallowing in the mire. In his own conception, Eucken is undoubtedly working not in the interest of a shallow optimism but of a living faith. This is summed up in his last book, "Dare We Yet be Christians?" His answer is: we not only can be, but we must be Christians.

We come then to ask what our philosopher considers Christianity to be. He is deeply in earnest, that we have seen. He is the far-famed protagonist of a spiritual life. This we rejoice in. He urges upon men Christian faith. Does he mean our Evangelical Christianity? In a word, no. This must be said at once in fairness to Prof. Eucken and to the Evangelical Church. Christianity Eucken believes in and strives toward and labors unceasingly for—but not that which we as Evangelical Christians understand by that term. He reaches his conceptions as philosopher who finds out things, not as theologian who receives things as posited and revealed of God.

There is, then, a real stimulus to faith in Eucken. It is seen in his historic method, in his sincere and careful thinking which contributes its moiety to the student of life. It is seen in his sense that all man's deeper truer life hangs together, that religion is the deepest of all, enriching and explaining all. It is seen in the recognition of our dual nature, of the awakening to the fact of evil, the soul sinning, of the preciousness of a spiritual personality. It is seen in the two phases of religion, the "Universal" demanding, the "Characteristic" supplying, which involve

God, Christ and satisfaction. It is seen in the recognition of and penetration into a nature now atomistic, now naturalistic, a nature higher than matter even, of things of science and art, social and ethics. It is seen in a philosophy not chiefly of the book, but supremely of man, a recognition of man's possibility of union with God. It is seen in the perception that true liberty is attainable only through the Giver, through God's pre-venience and a life of the spirit through self-dedication, and the immanence within our lives of the Transcendent.⁴

But Eucken wants a religious eirenicon, and in meeting this he performs some surgical operations on what is historic Christianity in the form we have it. He does not square with the Jesus of the Gospels. Yet even here he regards Jesus more than a mere man, rather holds Him as a "frontal personality." He who makes merely a normal man of Jesus can never, Eucken says, "do justice to His greatness." He protests against "such a flat rationalism." Yet Eucken negates all miracles except the miracle of the spiritual life. He deletes the Gospel of the Incarnation, the Trinity, the Virgin Birth, the Descent into Hell, the Resurrection and the Ascension as we conceive them as parts of a piece which must stand or fall together.

"He who wants one must not refuse the other. There is a tremendous logic about the development of these dogmas," he says. We will agree to the tremendousness and there is a tremendous truth there not to be negotiated away by any philosophical speculations, no matter on what assumption of friendliness to faith. He is convinced of the ethical basis of the atonement, but rejects its doctrinal implication as superseded. Mediatorship he holds as separating rather than uniting. Eucken recognizes that the person of Jesus retains a wonderful majesty—to him "it can no longer be an object of faith and Divine honor." Eucken's new Christianity, then, has and will have no central normative Lord of life. Its spirituality is an individual inwardness without a personal God relationship. It loses the hold on Him, "Who is before all things and in Whom all things created exist." Him who loved me and gave Himself for me.

Of course, we gladly admit that Christ and the subject of Christological speculation must always be open to clear thinking

⁴ Baron Von Hagel, *Hibbert Journal*, April 1912.

and the processes of proper criticism, but that our Christ has not been produced by the church, rather that He has Himself produced the church, must remain to us a fact proved historically and philosophically, a fact imperiously real.

I find myself heartily agreeing with the estimate that "In Eucken we must recognize a truly religious thinker who has entered deeply into the spirit of Christ's ethical teaching and has a profound conviction of the impregnable foundation of religion in the depths of human nature.⁵ But it goes without saying that as Christian leaders we cannot follow Eucken's speculations; for, first he fights shy of any reality save the spirit that is in man. He does not clearly allow of any unity not created by us and our experience. But the spirit life into which we enter is not made by us. "We find it because it is there, and it is there because a profound Reason, Will and Love," not our own, has put it there. There is ground and place for material symbols in church building, in Sacraments and in the sacred realities for which Eucken makes no provision.

Second, Prof. Eucken does not, and is not able to, find a place for the Person of Jesus Christ in all his uniqueness. He falls short of making Him the abiding revelation and incarnation of the Godhead. For Eucken "there is one God"—but not "One Lord Jesus Christ the Mediator between God and man." Therefore to all Christo-centric theology, especially to us Lutherans to whom Christ is central in Word and Sacrament, Prof. Eucken's philosophy is fatally defective.

Third. There is in Eucken no adequate understanding or valuation of our religious institutions as such. In spite of all the weaknesses of the Church organized and the Church as an organism it does supply the channels through which grace is ordinarily ministered to men. "Eucken has no explicit place for prayer. He does not discuss it." Nowhere do we find the place for direct and personal communion with God. The things which the Church supplies for the soul this philosophy either disavows or quietly passes over. But we can never disavow prayer or even tacitly "agree to disagree" about the possibility of communion with God.

And finally, and in view of these positions of Eucken, we are

⁵ *Lutheran Church Review*, Jan., *The Philosophy of R. Exeter Schwack.*

assured that Christianity becomes only one among many other historical religions. This Christianity is fettered by the bonds of logic and philosophy which it was not made to wear. It is enfeebled by the emasculation of the objective, supernatural which is its very heart and life. Eucken's philosophy believes in redemption and that is something. But it is a self-effected redemption, and not the redemption we have in Christ Jesus.

What then shall we do with the philosophy of Rudolph Eucken? At least this: remember that it is a philosophy. Philosophy seeks God; Theology finds Him.

No philosophy as such can be distinctly evangelical. For it has to build its own foundations and it finds no holding ground. Theology has its foundation already laid and an exclusive one. Other foundation can no man lay. Philosophy is always like Archimedes and gets no purchase to move worlds because it has no point fixed on which its lever can find support.

Prof. Eucken's is a philosophy. As a philosophy it touches many high places, but being a philosophy and only a philosophy it is like the statue of Nebuchadnezzar—though its head is gold and body of silver, its feet are clay. Philosophy has its own field and scope. They are manifest. But Christianity is not analyzed that way.

Let Eucken help men and some men he will help—towards spiritual thinking. But in another and supremely higher sense than Eucken's Jesus will ever call, in the categories of a universal philosophy—"Come unto Me and I will give you rest."

Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE PAPACY SINCE 1870.

BY REV. CHARLES WILLIAM HEATHCOTE.

The year 1850 marked a new epoch in the history and development of Italy. The earnest Italian patriots longed for a united country but it seemed as if their dreams would not be realized. The country was divided by factions within and harrassed by enemies without. The spirit of reaction was everywhere manifested throughout the peninsula except in the State of Piedmont. Piedmont was a constitutional State and it was to her leadership that Italian patriots looked for the fulfillment of their dreams.

CAVOUR AND ITALY.

Cavour was a strong believer in constitutional government. For years he had been a close student of English institutions and he urged very earnestly similar ones for his own country. In large measure due to his influence Piedmont created a constitution and organized a parliament in 1848. He became a member of the first parliament, was promoted to the cabinet in 1850, and was honored with the Premiership in 1852. As prime minister Cavour did his greatest work for Italy. In this capacity he became one of the greatest diplomats and statesmen of the nineteenth century. Through his influence Piedmont found a place among the great powers of Europe. When the Congress of Paris assembled in 1856, Cavour as the representative of Piedmont was informed that he would be received. It was Cavour's hope that the Italian situation would be brought before the Congress for discussion. Through Napoleon's (III) influence the Italian situation was brought to the attention of the Congress. This was the opportunity that Cavour desired as it would bring the Italian question in all its phases to the attention of the representatives of the great European powers. Cavour wanted the Congress to know that the two enemies which prevented Italian unification were Austria and the Papal Government. Austria was also represented at the Congress.

When the question came up for discussion, Clarendon, representing England, indignantly denounced the Papal Government as a "disgrace to Europe," and Ferdinand's misrule in Naples as crying for the intervention of the civilized world. This speech created an extraordinary sensation. Moreover, by bringing the Italian question forward, it furnished Cavour an opportunity to speak. His speech was brief, cautious and bold. The main cause of the evils from which Italy suffered was Austria, he declared. "Austria is the arch-enemy of Italian independence; the permanent danger to the only free nation in Italy, the nation which I have the honor to represent."¹

Cavour gained a great moral victory for Italy as a result of this conference. Interest and sympathy were aroused for the Italian cause throughout Europe and a profound impression was made by the denunciation of the Papacy, Naples and Austria at this great representative congress.

Cavour returned to Piedmont and proceeded on a policy of reconstruction. Growth and development were manifested everywhere. The Italian National Society was organized to encourage constructive policies and measures in all Italian States. "Independence and unity! out with the Austrians and the Pope," was the watchword. The ideal was to create a deeper sentiment for Italian unification and liberty.

Piedmont continued to be the leader among the Italian States and Cavour was doing all in his power to bring about Italian unification.

By 1860 through war, diplomacy and annexation the borders of Piedmont were greatly enlarged. Lombardy was secured from the Austrians, Modena, Parma, and Tuscany were gained by annexation and the Romagna where the papal power was overthrown also became Piedmontese territory. The Pope protested against this action but in vain.

In the latter part of 1860 the Kingdom of Naples was also annexed as a result of Garibaldi's spectacular campaign, Cavour's diplomacy and Victor Emmanuel's common sense. About this time the inhabitants of the Papal States of Umbria and the Marches desired to be annexed. After a brief conflict with the Papal army which Victor Emmanuel defeated, these States too

¹ Hazen, *Europe Since 1815*, p. 220.

were annexed. The Pope, whose capital was Rome, in the Patri-mony of St. Peter, was left undisturbed in this portion of his territory. He was guarded by French troops at Rome and Italy was not strong enough to enter into conflict with France. In 1861 Victor Emmanuel II was declared King of Italy.

The Pope vigorously protested against this new kingdom and king. He denounced the leaders and protested against the conquest of his territory. His protest in part was as follows: "It would be here superfluous to recall the sacred character of the possessions of the Church's patrimony and the right of the supreme pontiff to it,—an incontestable right, recognized at all times and by all governments. Therefore the Holy Father will never be able to recognize the title of King of Italy,....since it is opposed to justice and to the sacred property of the Church. On the contrary, he makes the most ample and formal protest against such an usurpation."²

It was Cavour's ambition to have the new Italian kingdom to get possession of Rome to be the capital of a united kingdom. Many opposed this plan as they thought it unjust to deprive the Pope of the last vestige of temporal power. Cavour was willing that the Pope should be protected in his spiritual power as he believed temporal power did not inherently belong to the papacy. Cavour used his influence to have the Italian Parliament pass legislative measures that Rome should be the capital of the kingdom. However, he did not live to have this great desire fulfilled. "Overwork, the extraordinary pressure under which he had for months been laboring, brought on insomnia; finally fever developed and he died on the morning of June 6th, 1861, in the very prime of life, for he was only fifty-one years of age."

THE VATICAN COUNCIL.

For many years Pope Pius IX thought of calling together a great council of churchmen at Rome. Some historians think that as early as 1846 he had the plan in mind. When the third centenary of the Council of Trent was observed at Rome in 1863 the proposition of convening a Vatican Council was broached and

² Robinson and Beard's, *Readings in Mod. Europ. Hist.* Vol. II, p. 130. Europe—Since 1815—Hazen, p. 239.

was favorably received. The Pope had several purposes in his mind upon which he desired a council to act and during the next few years these plans were definitely announced. When it was evident that the council would be convened several parties arose which advocated various measures upon which the council should take action.

One party represented by the extreme Ultramontanes strongly advocated the proclamation of the temporal power of the Pope as a dogma. When this proposition was set forth political conditions were favorable. The French army protected the last vestige of Papal temporal power and Austria and Spain had withheld their recognition of the Italian Kingdom. As much as the Pope may have favored the proclamation of this dogma yet the Vatican was silent with respect to plans and purposes. At the time for calling the convention together the political conditions which at one time were so favorable to the temporal power dogma were rapidly waning. Austria was defeated by Prussia in 1866 which resulted in the cession of Venetia to Italy and the recognition of the Italian Kingdom. Queen Isabella of Spain who favored the dogma was deposed from her throne. The rise of Prussia made the French support a negligible quantity.

By 1867 the plans for the council as held by Pope Pius IX were somewhat revealed. Certain disciplinary measures were to be brought before the body for consideration but the underlying object was to get the proclamation of the dogma of the Pope's infallibility. When this news became known throughout the world in some places it was received with enthusiasm and others gave the proposition a cold and indifferent reception.

One party, of which Manning was the head, as the result of a vow he had taken in 1867, prayed and agitated every day for the dogma of Infallibility. The second party desired to have the Pope clearly define what it was he meant by the dogma and at the same time they believed the authority of the Church would be weakened. A third party, led by Bishop Duplanloup, favored Infallibility but they were afraid it would be abused.

In the meanwhile as these discussions were being carried on the Church at large was anxiously waiting the Bull which would officially announce the convening of the council. It was issued on June 28th, 1868, stating that the council would meet at Rome on December 8, 1869. This Bull reads in part as follows:

"At this General Council there will be a careful examination and determination of everything that concerns the glory of God, the purity of the faith, the dignity of Divine service, the everlasting salvation of men, discipline, a profitable and thorough education of the priesthood, obedience to the laws of the Church, the promotion of morality, the Christian teaching of the young, peace and above everything, unity."³

Later orthodox Greek bishops and Protestants were invited to the council. The Greek bishops declined the invitation. Protestants learned that they would not be admitted *as such* to the sessions, but if they would become "converted" to the Catholic faith they would be received. Of course all Protestant theologians declined the invitations under those conditions.

After the Bull was issued the discussions over Infallibility broke forth anew. As the controversies continued it was evident that the chief business of the council would be to pass on the dogma. From articles which appeared in the *Civiltà Cattolica* (which many claimed to be the organ of the papacy) it was very clearly shown that Papal Infallibility would take precedence over the dogma of temporal power.

On December 8th, 1869, the council was opened with great pomp and ceremony. Archbishop Passavalli preached the sermon, and he was expected to voice the Pope's desire for Infallibility but his silence on the subject was significant of the opposition to the movement. After an address, blessing and prayer by the Pope the council was declared officially open. At the opening meeting 719 representatives were present from all parts of the world. "It is estimated that about 50 cardinals, 10 patriarchs, 130 archbishops, 522 bishops, and 30 generals of religious orders were at Rome. Out of this number 541 were Europeans (and of these more than half were Italians), 113 Americans, 83 Asiatics, 14 Africans, and 13 Australians."⁴

The council was divided into five congregations and the following cardinals presided over them: Reisach, De Luca, Bizzarri, Bilio and Capalti. Prince Orsini was appointed Protector-general of the gathering. The meetings were to be conducted as follows: committee, joint and public. In the committee meet-

³ History of the Papacy in the XIXth Century, by Nielsen, Vol. II, p. 295.

⁴ History of the Papacy in the XIXth Century, Nielsen, Vol. II, p. 318.

ings decisions on questions were to be worked out and at the joint meetings the decisions were to be voted on and passed and at the public meetings the results would be announced.

These arrangements hampered the council as various questions were not to come to the council directly. The major portion of the work was to be done outside of the council by a committee appointed by the Pope. Later a Bull was promulgated to the effect that if the Pope should die during the sessions, the council could not elect a new Pope, but the council must adjourn immediately. It would be for the new Pope to determine if he should wish a council to convene to act on similar propositions which were before the present council.

At the beginning of the sessions of the council the Pope desired to have all discussions kept secret but to this the council objected. The delegates were not permitted to leave the city, but later this rule was slightly modified. Hence the council was hampered in every way or as Dr. Nielsen remarks, "it was, therefore, not to be a 'free' council."

As the sessions continued it was evident that Pope Pius IX was determined to have the council formulate the dogma of Infallibility. He was the recognized leader of the Infallibilist Party and all who opposed the dogma were heretics.

The proposed dogma created much discussion in Europe and America. The movement had friends and enemies alike. However, it must be noted that though many favored it among the Papal adherents, yet a large minority of Catholics opposed it. The Protestant Church condemned it.

In the midst of this discussion Prince Hohenlohe, of Bavaria, suggested that the various nations should be represented at the council by special representatives of the governments. Prussia agreed to the plan. France pigeon-holed the suggestion. Austria and Spain were silent on the measure. The Pope was not in sympathy with the movement. The European nations did not act in concert and much criticism was directed against Prince Hohenlohe. The action of the council which the Prince calls the "declaration of war of the Church against the modern State" was made possible through the wavering policy of the Powers. Hence when the Powers refused to act in conference to send governmental representatives to the council there was nothing for him to do but to recede from his position. In defense of his

action and as a reply to his critics in a memorandum dated March 24, 1870, he says: "But an error, though pardonable, is still an error, and it may therefore be permitted to scrutinize more carefully the measures with the neglect of which the Bavarian Government is reproached. The representation of the Bavarian Government on the council presupposes the acceptance of its minister, and that the Bavarian envoy should not be the sole lay member of the council. Now the question of sending representatives to the Vatican Council has often been considered, and by all the European Governments. But instead of a common decision arrived at by a European Conference, for instance, as proposed by Prince Hohenlohe—all the powers of Europe preferred to decide separately, and in fact decided in the negative. When Bavaria learned this, nothing remained for her but to give up the idea of sending a representative to the council. A Bavarian minister or orator who would be the only lay member, would not have been accepted, or if he had been admitted, would have played a sorry if not a ridiculous role."⁵

As the council was meeting in Rome, and as a result of recent political revolutions, and not wishing to antagonize the Church, the Italian Government remained passive during this diplomatic discussion. "For Italy the Infallibility, and yet more, the definition of the temporal dogma, constituted a double political danger, but the Italian Government could take no action to obstruct it. It was needful for them to demonstrate that they interpreted liberty in its widest sense, especially in respect to the Church and its head. It would do nothing which might be interpreted as impeding the freedom of the bishops to go to Rome."⁶

The Infallibilist adherents had hoped in the earlier sessions of the council to have the dogma unanimously proclaimed. However, they were very much disappointed as a strong minority opposed it. The diplomatic and polemical discussions encouraged the minority. It was evident that the opposition was fighting a losing struggle. The majority was too large to be overcome and the Pope was using all the power at his command to have the dogma proclaimed unanimously. The debates in the council were marked by bitterness. On March 22 the discussions became

5 Memories of Prince Hohenlohe, Vol. II, p. 4.

6 Last Days of Papal Rome, De Cesare, p. 428.

so bitter and personal that De Cesare observes that "the assembly was transformed into a howling, menacing mob."

Pius IX had great hopes for himself in the formulation of this dogma. He thought its effects would be far reaching. He believed it would prevent the development of the modern State, curb revolution and procure in toto the temporal dogma.

The consideration of the dogma of Infallibility engrossed all the sessions of the council. All kinds of arguments and sophistries were used to secure a unanimous vote. The efforts of the ministry were in vain. Finally July 18th was set aside as the date on which the vote was to be taken. The delegates were weary with the struggle and the impending Franco-Prussian war made many of the bishops anxious to return to their dioceses and homes. On the eve of July 18th, fifty-five bishops sent the Pope a letter stating that they opposed Infallibility but would not attend the sessions to vote out of respect to the Pope, their Father.

When the vote was taken on July 18th, five hundred and thirty-three voted in the affirmative and two bishops of the minority voted *non placet*. However, it is reported that these two bishops changed their votes to *placet* before departing to their homes. It is estimated that about two hundred delegates remained away from the final session.

When the result became known the Pope confirmed the action of the council and the dogma of Infallibility was established. The proclamation of the dogma in reality ended the council. The announcement of the vote was not received with very much interest at Rome or throughout the world.

"By the proclamation of Infallibility the ultramontane party in the Roman Church had for the present reached its aim. But the council had not fulfilled all the wishes of Ultramontanism. Several groups of the fathers of the council had hoped to have the bodily ascension of Mary dogmatically defined, as her immaculate conception had been defined long before."⁷

"No council was ever poorer in practical and positive results; in none did political sentiments predominate more completely over religious interests; in none, perhaps, had the Pope taken so direct a part in favor of a thesis which interested him personally."⁸

⁷ History of the Papacy in the XIXth Century, Dr. Nielsen, Vol. II, p. 373
⁸ The Last Days of Papal Rome, De Cesare, p. 437.

THE END OF PAPAL TEMPORAL POWER.

The proclamation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility had not affected the Italian nation in the least. Italy was more prosperous at this time and more strongly united, perhaps, than at any time in her history. There was not an Italian State that desired to go back to the old order of things.

Rome was the only obstacle that stood in the way of complete Italian unification. Emperor Napoleon III was in reality the only guarantee to the Pope's temporal power. The French troops which were quartered at Rome protected the Pope and his temporal claims. The Italian people desired to possess Rome as their capital, but Napoleon refused to withdraw his troops.

Napoleon had a strong ambition to be the dictator of policies of Continental Europe and he watched with an uneasy spirit the rapid development of Prussia. As early as 1868 he sought to make an alliance with Austria and Italy in order to be strongly fortified against Prussia in case war should arise between the two nations. Diplomatic conferences continued between the three nations for two years and France found herself involved in war with Prussia without the alliances being completed.

Napoleon had hoped that Italy would come to his aid in the beginning of this war and he had counted on her furnishing a large army. King Victor Emmanuel was willing to assist Napoleon but his cabinet and parliament refused. The Italian people were opposed to helping him in any way and meetings of the populace were held protesting against it. The enmity against Napoleon on the part of the populace arose because he kept the French troops at Rome and deprived them of their capital.

However, diplomacy might have overcome this opposition, but the defeats of the French armies by Prussia especially when the defeats at Worth and Sedan followed in such rapid succession, made alliance with Austria and Italy impossible.

The war with Prussia compelled Napoleon to withdraw his troops from Rome. By August 5th Napoleon had withdrawn all of his troops from the Papal city. Pius IX, therefore, was left without real defense and strong support. Within a month after this radical changes had been brought about. The Prussians had defeated decisively the French armies and Emperor Napoleon III was a prisoner. The effect of this news at the Vatican was

truly distressing. "The sensation created in Rome by the catastrophe of September 2 was tremendous. The powerful Emperor vanquished and a prisoner! A mighty Catholic empire to fall before a Protestant nation! For twenty years Napoleon III had been the true sovereign of Rome, where he had many friends and relations who remembered him as a student and a fugitive, and whom at the climax of his power he had never forgotten. Without him the temporal power would never have been reconstituted, nor, being reconstituted, would have endured."⁹

The downfall of Napoleon brought the Roman question immediately to the attention of the Italian Government for solution. One party urged that Rome be entered immediately by Italian troops and proclaimed the capital of a united country and at the same time a threat was made to the effect that if this policy was not carried out the royal family would be deposed and an Italian Republic proclaimed. Another party objected to occupying Rome unless the Pope consented to it. In the meantime the King and his ministers were severely criticised by the Italian people for their so-called inaction and conservatism. It is true there was a division among the ministers with respect to occupying Rome, but King Victor Emmanuel through diplomatic channels was endeavoring to find out the trend of opinion of the other nations with respect to the question. The ministry hoped that events would arise which would make it necessary for Italian troops to occupy the city. The King himself realized that his government was pledged to a policy which necessitated making Rome the capital.

The Pope's temporal power was dependent entirely upon the support of one of the great European powers. He had at his command about 13,000 paid troops but they were not sufficient to uphold the claim of temporal power. It was not long after the French had departed that anarchistic riots took place in various towns of the Papal States. The Pope was unable to quell the disturbances. These uprisings alarmed the law-abiding people and deputations were sent to Victor Emmanuel urging him to restore order.

In the meantime the French Emperor had fallen. A French

⁹ *Last Days of Papal Rome*, De Cesare, p. 443.

Republic was established. This change gave Italy a free hand with respect to Rome as all former agreements which had been made with Napoleon ceased.

The various European governments also assured the Italian ministers that Italy would not be interfered with. Therefore in view of these various facts the King and the Italian ministry decided it was necessary to send their troops to Rome. On September 7th an official letter was issued in which the governmental policy was outlined from which we quote in part as follows:

"The peace of Italy was endangered, because a theocratic government was kept up in an enclave within the peninsula, which was distinctly hostile to the kingdom, and which by its own confession could not exist without foreign aid. The Italian Government must therefore reserve to itself the right of interfering as soon as there was danger of bloodshed in the Papal territory, or if the security of the Pope were threatened. In such case, orders would be given to occupy those points which, for the sake of the public safety, must needs be occupied; but for the rest, the Italian Government would let the population itself see to the direction of its affairs, and would do no more than safeguard the independence of the Papacy, which must be a matter of concern to all States which had Roman Catholic subjects."¹⁰

In order to acquaint the Pope officially with its intentions the Italian Government commissioned Count of San Martino as a special ambassador to the Vatican. He left Florence for Rome on September 8th, the day following the issuance of the official circular. The Count bore a special letter to Pope Pius IX from King Victor Emmanuel. The King showed in his letter that he was an earnest and devoted Catholic and that Italy in carrying out the proposed measures would be aided by the Pope. The King also pointed out the necessity of entering the Papal States to protect the Pope and at the same time to restore law and order. He also showed that the Pope's spiritual prerogatives would not be interfered with, but the King as a Catholic and spiritual subject of the Pope would do all in his power to support him.

Pope Pius IX rejected the overtures of King Victor Emmanuel and accorded the Court a very cold reception. He condemned the King and severely criticised the proposed measures of the Italian Government.

10 History Papacy XIXth Century, VII. II, p. 386.—Dr. Nielsen.

The Pope determined to defend his territory and therefore ordered his troops prepared for battle. When the Government learned of San Martino's failure, General Cadorna with his troops was ordered to enter the Papal States. After a short and ineffective struggle the papal territory was captured. On the 21st of September 1870, General Codorna entered Rome. By agreement with the Papal authorities the utmost protection and respect were granted the Pope, cardinals, clergy, monks and nuns. All the papal territory except the Vatican and St. Peter's came into the possession of Italy.

In the meantime efforts were made to bring about a reconciliation with the Pope under the new order of things but in vain. The Pope would not receive any of the Italian officials.

On October 2, the plebiscite was taken in order that popular expression might be given with respect to the union with Italy. The results were as follows: "Forty thousand seven hundred and eighty-five Romans had voted Aye, 46 No. In the Leonine city 1,556 had voted Aye, 1 No. In the city and province of Rome, in Civita Vecchia, Viterbo, Velletri and Frosinone, there were altogether 167,548 voters; 133,681 voted Aye, 1,507 No."¹¹ When King Victor Emmanuel received the news of the vote he was highly gratified and pleased.

During this time efforts were made to get the Pope to leave Rome, but he refused. He preferred to remain a "prisoner" as he termed it. The Italian Government assured the world and the Vatican as well that it would do all in its power to support the spiritual independence of the Church. Through a series of decrees Italy proclaimed the Pope's person sacred and inviolable as the King's and all crimes against it would be severely punished. The freedom of the Papal press was guaranteed and Papal proclamations would be allowed to be posted at the Vatican and the three principal Roman Churches. Later, May 13th, 1871, these guarantees were elaborated and the Italian Government agreed to pay annually to Pope Pius IX and his successors 3,225,000 lire.

The Pope rejected these decrees and guarantees and later refused to accept any stipend offered by the Italian Government. On November 1, 1870, Pope Pius IX issued an encyclical letter

¹¹ History of the Papacy in the 19th Century, Vol. II, p. 399 Dr. Nielsen.

putting his enemies, the conquerors of his temporal power, under the ban of the Church. From this time on,—to the death of Pope Pius IX which occurred February 7th, 1878, Papal ministers and councillors sought to have Roman Catholic governments restore Papal temporal authority,—but their efforts were unsuccessful. Thus the successors of Pope Pius IX continue to be "prisoners" at the Vatican.

POPE LEO XIII AND THE KULTUR-KAMPF.

On February 20th 1878, Cardinal Pecci, Leo XIII, was elevated to the Papal chair by the Conclave. As the successor of Pope Pius IX he was quite different in temperament and characteristics. He was highly educated and intelligent, diplomatic, keen and the possessor of an analytic mind.

In a certain sense Leo XIII carried out the political policies of Pius IX. He refused to recognize the Italian Government, rejected the law of guarantees and the personal stipend granted him by the government. Leo XIII pursued a diplomatic and tactful policy of conciliation. His first encyclical letter showed very clearly his policy of conciliation. It was free from controversy and polemics. He did not throw down the gauntlet to the Italian Government because the Vatican had lost her temporal power nor was he polemical toward any government. His letter strongly inveighed against the evils of modern society and he showed how they should be remedied. His policy was strongly critical in many places but it soon became evident that his plan was a wise one. He brought the Catholic Church to be more highly esteemed and honored by governments and people alike.

The greatest struggle of the reign of Pope Leo XIII which tested his diplomatic and conciliatory policies was the German Kultur-Kampf. He inherited this struggle from the reign of Pope Pius IX and it became acute in the early years of the rule of Leo XIII.

The German Kultur-Kampf was a struggle on the part of the new German empire against the Catholic Church with respect to the religious educational problem. Since the Reformation the Protestants were the strongest religious party in Germany. Prussia was the strongest Protestant State, the Lutherans were the dominant denomination. The South German States, Bavaria and Baden were the strongholds of the Catholic Church. The

Prussian Constitution of 1850 granted large liberties to the Church. From 1850 to 1865 the Catholic Church made wonderful progress largely as a result of the Jesuit Society. Many people became alarmed at this rapid growth.

The wars which Germany carried on with Austria and France in which she was victorious were looked upon by many as religious wars. Germany as a Protestant nation had triumphed over two strong Catholic powers.

It was a common belief at the time that the French Empress Eugenie had been urged by the Vatican to influence her husband Napoleon III to bring on a war with Germany. The great German statesman and diplomat, Prince Bismarck, accepted this belief as fact.

Whatever activities in the political world Pope Pius IX may have carried on at this time it is evident that neither he nor his ministers were active in bringing about the Franco-Prussian war. It was largely the scheme of a selfish ambition on the part of Napoleon III. He was guided by an ambition to emulate the Empire of Napoleon I. His part in the Mexican expedition which ended in such dismal failure revealed the imperial policy. Justin McCarthy who was a careful observer of events at that time wrote "that Mexico would be the Moscow of the Second Empire," which it proved to be. The disastrous Mexican expedition injured Napoleon's influence at home and abroad. In order to save his tottering throne and empire Napoleon took a final chance by entering upon a war with Prussia. The result was the overthrow of the Empire and the proclamation of the new German Empire at Versailles.

As was mentioned Prince Bismarck believed that the Vatican was largely responsible for the Franco-Prussian war. When the new German Empire was proclaimed Bismarck determined to pursue a policy which would bring all religious and educational teaching under the control of the State in order that the empire would be free from Vatican influence. This action was one of the main causes of the Kultur-Kampf.

Another cause was the formulation of the Dogmas of Papal Infallibility by the Vatican Council in 1870. Protestant Germany and a large number of German Catholic bishops and leaders were strongly opposed to the dogma. In the council the German bishops were among those in the minority who opposed

the dogma. In Germany tracts and pastoral letters were published opposing the dogma. The letters and articles which appeared in the Augsburg *Allgemeine Zeitung* were very critical of the council. The proclamation of the dogma affected universities, schools, churches and people. A large number of professors and priests accepted it, but many refused to do so. Those refusing were put under the ban of the Church and excommunicated. As a result the religious struggle became more acute. By a series of parliamentary acts the German Empire took a positive stand in the struggle.

Parliament by the act of June 1872 put the Jesuits under the ban of the law and all foreign members of the society were expelled from the borders of the Empire. The native German members were allowed to remain in certain zones and if they were found guilty of any breach of the law they were likewise to be expelled.

Parliament by another act in April 1873 invested the State with the right of supervision and management of all Catholic institutions. During the next two years other acts were passed through the leadership of Dr. Falk, the Minister of Public Worship, and by the support of Bismarck. The following is a resume of the acts: "Every young man in the Kingdom of Prussia who desired to become a member of the Roman Catholic priesthood, was compelled to follow the course of a German university, according to a system of teaching established by the State. The students of theology were prevented, during their university course from joining any ecclesiastical seminary. Every institution designed for the education of the Catholic clergy was placed under the control of the State. All the nominations to parochial functions had to be announced in advance to the authorities of each province in which the nominations were made, and these authorities had the right to forbid the nominations if the candidates, in their judgment, seemed to be persons likely to interfere with the proper working of the State laws and by consequence with public order. Another act gave the power to the Government of deposing any minister of the Catholic Church, whose acts or whose sermons seemed dangerous to the preservation of established laws. A special tribunal was created for dealing with ecclesiastical affairs, and to this tribunal was given the power of deposing bishops, or other priests, a continuation of whose func-

tions might seem to the court a danger to public order. The acts absolutely suppressed the ecclesiastical authority of the Vatican in Prussia.”¹²

The spiritual war reached its most acute stage from 1875 to 1878. Pope Pius IX would not yield a single point and Prince Bismarck saw that the laws were enforced. Many of the archbishops and priests suffered imprisonment in consequence. This state of affairs continued until the death of Pope Pius IX which occurred in 1878.

When Leo XIII came to the Papal throne in 1878 a new policy was inaugurated at the Vatican. As has been stated his policy was one of reconstruction and conciliation. Shortly after his elevation to the Papal throne Leo XIII wrote a letter to the German Emperor Willian I in which he expressed regret that the cordial relations which had formerly existed should in these later years be broken. He expressed the hope that justice would be done his Catholic subjects whom the Pope knew would be faithful to the State and at the same time that friendship with the Vatican would be restored.

This spirit of conciliation on the part of Pope Leo XIII opened up and prepared the way for negotiations of peace. The first step occurred in suspending the Falk laws in 1879. Further negotiations led the Vatican to state officially in the early part of the year 1883 that the bishops should present to the German Government the names of all candidates for the priesthood before they were actually inducted into the office.

“Some of the Prussian Ultramontanes were greatly dissatisfied with the concessions made by the Pope, and went so far as to call Leo’s action a policy of unconditional surrender.”¹³

For this concession the German Parliament in July of 1883 made further concessions to the Papacy. The act of Parliament is described as follows: “Under this Bill the obligation of notifying appointments bestowed upon ordained priests, and the faculty of exercising spiritual functions was extended to all the sees in the kingdom; while questions relating to ecclesiastical offices, the appointment of teachers in ecclesiastical training colleges, and the exercises of episcopal rights in vacant sees were

12 Pope Leo XIII.—Justin McCarthy—p. 61.

13 Pope Leo XIII.—Justin McCarthy, p. 122.

transferred from the Ecclesiastical Courts to the Minister of Public Worship, whose interest it is to cultivate the goodwill of the hierarchy."¹⁴

In 1886 the Falk laws were abrogated which in reality ended the Kultur-Kampf.

The concessions which were made by Bismarck were not made particularly in the interests of religion but in order to help his policy in national politics. He desired the support of the Catholic party in order to combat the socialistic tendencies which were threatening the peace and unity of the new empire.

Of course when the new Pope showed the conciliatory spirit Bismarck was ready to make concessions which finally terminated the Kultur-Kampf.

On May 11th and June 2nd, 1878, two unsuccessful attempts had been made to assassinate the German Emperor William I. The would-be assassins were fanatical socialists. These events and many others made Bismarck anxious to control the rapidly growing socialistic party. As was stated the concessions that Bismarck made which eventually ended the Kultur-Kampf were made more for political than religious reasons. Consequently he secured in large measure the support of the Catholic party for his economic and social policies.

The Kultur-Kampf struggle and its conclusion was the most notable event of Pope Leo's long reign. By his diplomacy and tact, the fostering of peace between Church and State and his interest, and zeal in the promotion of the cause of higher education, Pope Leo XIII placed the Catholic Church in a higher position of honor and respect than it had occupied for centuries. He died July 20, 1903.

POPE PIUS X.

Shortly after the death of Pope Leo XIII the Conclave of Cardinals assembled in order to elect his successor. When the conclave met it was evident that two factions were present who would use all influence possible to have their respective candidates elected. The one party supported Cardinal Rampolla who had been the power behind the Papal throne during the declining years of

¹⁴ Annual Register, 1883, p. 240.

Pope Leo XIII. The second party favored Cardinal Vennutelli. However, the chances of Cardinal Rampolla's election seemed favorable.

But Austria was opposed to the election of Cardinal Rampolla as he was looked upon as the candidate of France. By a letter dated August 2, 1903, conveyed through the offices of Cardinal Puzyua, the Austrian Emperor and King of Hungary claiming the right to use an ancient law and privilege exercised the Veto of Exclusion against the election of Cardinal Rampolla.¹⁵

Against this action many of the Cardinals of the Conclave protested. The result was that the offended cardinals supported and voted for Cardinal Sarto, the Patriarch of Venice who was elected to the Papal throne on the seventh ballot August 4, 1903. He accepted the election and became Pope under the name of Pius X.

This action of the Austrian Emperor was an outrage upon the Conclave since it hampered it and restricted it. Or as Sabatier has well said, "since an election which is not free is not canonical, it follows that the election of Pius X was not canonical"

The reign of Pope Pius X has been marked by the most cordial relations with the Italian State. Not much is heard to-day about the Pope being a "prisoner" at the Vatican nor is there any attempt to put rumors afloat that the Pope is going to leave Rome. The present policy is to take advantage wherever possible of the liberal grants made by the Italian Government to the Church.

"But although Rome has ceased to be the Papal city it is still the center of Catholic Christendom, and of late years Catholic fraternities, and organizations of all kinds have made it their home, until now it numbers more religious houses than in the old Papal days. This is of itself a tribute to the liberal treatment which the Italian Government accords even to its enemies. At the very moment when Roman Catholic politicians in foreign countries were crying out against the cruelty of keeping the Pope "a prisoner" in the Vatican, Catholic priests, monks and nuns were flocking to Rome to establish themselves there, where they feel secure in their persons and their property. Not only have they invested large sums in real estate and buildings, but it is no

15 Cf. *Les Derniers Jours De Léon XIII et Le Conclave—Revue De Deux Mondes*—Apr.-May 1904—pp. 280-281.

secret that the Papal corporations are "heavy holders of Italian Government securities."¹⁶

On the whole the policies of Pope Pius X have been marked by reaction. As a result the alliance between the Church and the French Republic has been severed. The Republic has granted sectarian liberty to the various creeds and denominations which has proved satisfactory and the laws are acceptable to large numbers of Catholics. Even in Spain, the stronghold of the Catholic Church, the Papal reactionary policies have weakened the prestige of the Church.

The most reactionary documents to be issued by Pope Pius X was his Encyclical Letter on the Doctrines of the Modernists dated September 8, 1907.

MODERNISM.

Modernist tendencies in reality had their incipiency in the work of Marsilio of Padua of the fourteenth century. His plans antedated in large measure the work carried out by the great reformer, Luther.

The present Modernist movement began in Italy about the middle of the nineteenth century. Italy has contributed in large measure to the advancement and spread of the movement in the United States, England, Germany, France, Austria, Switzerland and Belgium.

The motive of the Modernist movement in the modern sense began among men who were preparing for the priesthood who recognized Papal authority and who were zealously devoted to the Church, but at the same time they recognized the great advances Science had made and the flood of light which had been thrown upon theological and Biblical studies and they earnestly desired a reconstruction of Catholic doctrines and theology.

"Science had opened men's eyes to behold a practically new physical universe. But, as Italy's earlier Renaissance was followed by a great religious movement,—in which, unfortunately, Italy only very slightly participated—this later Renaissance likewise has begotten a wide-spread religious reform, in which happily the Italian peninsula does participate. The critical study of religion, though as yet only in its initial stages, has revealed

16 *Italica*.—Thayer, pp. 336-337.

to the astonished Modernist the possibilities of a totally new conception of the Church, its government, and the whole temporal administration of divine things."¹⁷

The modernist movement is not an infidel or rationalistic one. It is a deep, genuine religious tendency which is seeking to bring about reconstruction in the Catholic Church.

The Modernist movement is not a Protestant movement but essentially Catholic. It has had its incipiency in the Catholic Church. It is a movement that stands positively for the freedom of the intellect and liberty of conscience in the Catholic Church.

Concerning it Sabatier has well said: "Modernism is in no degree contained in an intellectual proposition; it is not a system, or a new synthesis, it is an orientation. It is more than a vital or strenuous effort, for an effort implies an act of conscious will, and the movement is, in its origin, a thing essentially natural and unforced. It is a welling-up of sap, of life, of which one is conscious, but which nothing could have brought about if the time had not been fulfilled."¹⁸

The name Modernism which has been given to this movement was coined by the Jesuit leaders at Rome out of ridicule to the tendencies which they have bitterly opposed. Pope Pius X has given official currency to the name in the Bulls and Encyclical Letters he has issued against the movement.

Since Pope Pius X has come to the Papal throne he has made every possible effort to overcome the Modernist tendencies. His first effort was directed against the Seminaries and Universities in Italy. All historical studies of the Bible and religion which savoured in any way of Modernist tendencies were forbidden.

In an Encyclical Letter dated July 28, 1906, Pope Pius X says: "Let a proper spirit be jealously maintained in the seminaries, and let their purpose remain exclusively to prepare young men, not for civil careers, but for the lofty mission of ministers of Christ. Let the study of Philosophy, Theology and the allied sciences, and especially of Holy Scripture, be carried on, holding fast to the Pontifical orders, and to the study of St. Thomas, so often enjoined by our venerable predecessor, and by us in our Apostolic Letters of January 23, 1904. Let the bishops exercise the most scrupulous vigilance over the masters and their doc-

17 Modernism in Italy.—Jordan, p. 11.

18 Modernism.—Sabatier, p. 69.

trines, recalling to their duty those who may have run after dangerous novelties, and relentlessly removing from the office of teacher all those who do not profit by the admonitions they have received.

Let not young clerics be permitted to frequent the public universities, except for very weighty reasons and with the greatest precautions on the part of the bishops. Let the pupils in the seminaries be entirely prevented from taking any part whatsoever in external agitations; and, to this end, we forbid them to read newspapers and periodicals, with the exception of some one periodical of sound principles which the bishop may judge convenient to be studied by the pupils. Let the disciplinary arrangements be maintained with ever greater rigor and vigilance.”¹⁹

Later Pope Pius X began a general warfare against Modernism in the Catholic Church throughout the world. On September 8, 1907, he issued his famous Encyclical Letter against it. It is not within the compass of this paper to enter into a detailed discussion of the Encyclical Letter but there are three salient features which require discussion.

Pope Pius X claims that the Modernists desire to reject the authority of the Church. To this the Modernists reply that they are not lacking in respect to the Church or seeking to do away with the authority of the Church, but their aims at reform are directed against the governmental policies of the Church. They want the governmental form changed from its present strongly centralized form to a more decentralized policy in order that the lower orders of clergy and laity may participate in its direction. If these reforms can be brought about,—Sabatier, who is a Modernist, says: “No longer will there be on one side omniscience and on the other absolute ignorance; on one side tyranny and on the other servitude; there will be on the one side understanding and on the other obedience—the obedience of a being who feels his weakness and his need of guidance, but has already a glimpse of vaster horizons, who hears the mysterious sigh of creation in travail and wishes to do his part as a good husbandman, to give forth his note in the harmony of the worlds.”²⁰

19 Modernism.—Sabatier, Translation Encyclical Letter, p. 187.

20 Modernism.—Sabatier, p. 143.

Pope Pius X claims that the Modernists by their so-called historical methods of study would destroy the Holy Scriptures. He forbids any such methods to be used in Catholic Seminaries, Universities or Churches.

The Modernist replies that is just what he does not want to do. They want to study the Bible from the viewpoint of constructive criticism instead of destructive. The motive of the Modernist is not to tear down but to build up and strengthen spiritual beliefs. The Modernist claims that only a true historical scientific study of God's Word will ever give to the Catholic Church the genuine respect which as the Church she merits.

Pope Pius X has placed under the ban of the Church all Modernist writings. In the Encyclical Letter of 1907 he writes as follows: "It is also the duty of the bishops to prevent writings of Modernists, or whatever savours of Modernism or promotes it, from being read when they have been published, and to hinder their publication when they have not. No books or papers or periodicals whatever of this kind are to be permitted to seminarists or university students. The injury to them would be not less than that which is caused by immoral reading—nay, it would be greater, for such writings poison Christian life at its very fount. The same decision is to be taken concerning the writings of some Catholics, who, though not evilly disposed themselves, are ill-instructed in theological studies and imbued with modern philosophy, and strive to make this harmonize with the faith, and, as they say, to turn it to the profit of the faith. The name and reputation of these authors cause them to be read without suspicion, and they are, therefore, all the more dangerous in gradually preparing the way for Modernism."²¹

Against this stifling of scholarship and the censorship of the press the Modernists strongly protest. They object to such reactionary movements on the part of the Catholic Church. They claim it is a revival of fourteenth century mediaevalism. The only way they have been able to surmount this obstacle is by resorting to anonymous publications.

Philadelphia, Pa.

21 Modernism.—Sabatier, Translation Encyclical Letter, pp. 330-331.

ARTICLE IX.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

"The Permanent Menace of Rome," by T. Knappe, translated by Dr. Wackernagel, is the title of an interesting article in the (July) *Lutheran Church Review*. He holds that Romanism is essentially the same as it was at the time of the Reformation. It no more recognized the Renaissance of the 16th century than it does that of to-day. It closed its eyes to human progress then, and it rejects all "modern" advance now. It still clings to its mediaeval views of human life. It forbids liberty to higher learning. It clings to tradition rather than to Scripture. It rejected Pauline justification by faith and substituted salvation by works. It has not modified this position. "He who sojourns for awhile in a Roman Catholic country gets the saddening impression that the gospel of the all-sufficient and every valid sacrifice of Christ has never been heard." The peril to the Lutheran Church comes from the low standards of Roman which lure people out of the right way, from the pomp and ceremony which attract them, and from the effort to have rescinded the law which banished the Jesuits from the Fatherland. An effort is being made to re-establish the so-called "Society of Jesus" that it may resume its nefarious operations.

In the same *Review*, Dr. Schmauk discusses the Basis of Christian Union proposed by "the Disciples of Christ, or the Christians." This large denomination, with a membership of over a million, has made great progress. Some of its people have attained high places in the nation. It supports missions in foreign lands, maintains many journals, and controls over forty colleges. Its attitude on the union of Christendom is, therefore, worthy of consideration. Some of its "more liberal members claim that its very existence is for the purpose of bringing about Christian union." They affect to believe that the acceptance of the way of the disciples by all Christians would solve the whole problem. We condense the Disciples' Message as follows:

1. Division hinders spiritual growth and the conquest of the world, and therefore union holds priority over all other issues.
2. That since the Sonship and Messiahship of Jesus furnish the basis of Christianity, acknowledgment of those facts out of a living faith in Him and obedience to Him is the all-sufficient basis for the union of the divided Church."
3. That since no one is infallible we should abandon all systems of theology as tests of fellowship, and go directly back to Scripture.
4. That since there are two covenants—the Old Testament and the New Testament—and the first being done away in Christ, the New Testament is the only book of authority in the Christian life.
5. That, in the plan of salvation, the order of the New Testament appears to be, hearing the Gospel, believing it, repenting of sin, confessing Jesus Christ and being baptized in obedience to Him as man's part.
6. That from the New Testament baptism seems to be a spiritual symbolic ordinance, performed by immersion of the penitent believer into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.
7. That the Scriptural names for believers express more definitely the believer's relationship to Christ and are less conducive to division than any others.
8. That the remembrance of the death and the resurrection of Jesus should be commemorated by the weekly observance of the Lord's Supper.
9. That the interpretation of these and other facts generally accepted by the Church are matters of private opinion, as is the order of worship and the organization, which beyond elders and deacons in each church (and even that organization is not essential) appears to be left to conditions as they arise, only that the spirit of Christian democracy be maintained.

Concerning this platform of union as developed and illustrated by the Disciples, Dr. Schmauk has the following to say:

1. That mere union would not heal the hurt of the Church. "The mighty Word of God, which is a living germ from heaven, and not the Church, whether in union or disunion, nor man's propositions or agreements or ideas or activities, is the one effective agency for the growth of the Kingdom." Frictions and

jealousies would arise within the union as they do now outside of it.

2. The premise is not necessarily a clear and all-sufficient statement of the basis of Christianity. The atonement of Christ, the sin of man, and the justification of the sinner, the Word of the Spirit, are facts that need to be added in clear-cut language in order to gain "the all-sufficient basis."

3. The abandonment of systems of theology proposes the rejection of the experience of the Church extending over many generations in favor of the cross and untested individual experience of the individual thinker of to-day. This would inevitably become a fountain-head of still further division, discussion and sectarianism. Moreover, systems of theology are not now tests of fellowship, but creeds and confessions are.

4. Here is a confusion between a covenant and its revelation. The fundamental principles of the two covenants are one and the same. The old covenant has indeed been done away; but the Old Testament Scriptures still contain many prophecies and warnings that have not been fulfilled.

5. This point presents only the human side of the plan of salvation, ignoring the divine side.

6. Baptism is here underestimated as to its content, and overestimated as to its form. Immersion has been a most fruitful source of controversy. All objection to it must now be laid aside. This platform practically declares: Theology has ruined Christianity. The whole of Christianity must unite. In order to unite, all must agree to baptize by immersion. This immersion is really not into the name; it is immersion into water. How could a believer be literally submerged beneath the deep-flowing waves of such a non-physical thing as the Name of God?

7. As to Scriptural names, if any significance is to be attached, why not "Those of the Way" or "The Saints?"

8. There is really no objection to the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper except as such a minor matter of time is stipulated as a basis of union. Moreover, they are emphasizing the mere memorial idea of the Supper and saying nothing of its content. Thus they show that they are adherents of Zwinglian theology, and yet they would eliminate theology.

9. We are satisfied that "order of worship" and "organization" be left to conditions as they arise; but the proposed basis

imposes a condition—"the spirit of Christian democracy." The Presbyterian Church is an aristocracy; and the Roman Church and the Salvation Army are monarchies. The basis may be correct; but its position violates its fundamental idea of abiding by the bare facts of Scripture. The idea of a democracy is certainly an interpretation.

The proposal of the Disciples is one among many offered for the union of Christendom. "We do not believe that the problem is ripe for solution at this date. Much of the fruit now offered is still green."

The Constructive Quarterly (Sept.) devotes much space to the consideration of the union of Christendom. Contributors representing the Greek, the Roman, the Anglican, the American Episcopal, the Congregational, the Methodist and the Disciple Churches. Archbishop Platon writing for the Orthodox (Greek) Church holds that in spite of all apparent impossibilities unity is nevertheless possible. He deplores the fact that while the powers of the world are now arising against our faith, "we Christians are divided into fragments, isolating ourselves in the consciousness that we believe in Christ in a more correct way than other believers." His plea is for one faith, as a living power in the soul. He holds that while the "Orthodox" Church can give up nothing, it can learn much from others.

A most pathetic, passionate cry comes from Italy from the lips of the Bishop of Cremona. He recognizes that a union of Christendom is imperative—especially between the Roman and the Protestant churches; but the enormous obstacles appal him. The Roman Church can never recede, "review its own decisions, modify its dogmas, change its hierarchy, lessen its authority." "How can we, as it were, put in doubt what has been declared undoubted and indubitable. The more I think of it, the more I feel my heart wrung, as I see the impossibility of finding a way out of so terrible a difficulty. We Catholics cannot suffer that to come in question which we have declared to be the *truth*. We should be traitors to our faith. But you, my ever dear brothers, especially you English, you have not the insuperable difficulty which exists for us, because you have not, strictly speaking, adopted any dogmatic definition since your separation. We have the definition behind us, we have the *impassable abyss*, you

have it not. Come over the gulf to us: we will forthwith throw our arms about your neck, we shall all be the sons of the same Mother, and of the same Father who is in heaven; and quickly the earth shall be changed, and the great ship of the united Church will sail in safety upon the troubled waters, and gather in the millions of scattered sons throughout all the coasts."

Dr. Kershner, President of the Texas Christian University, makes in substance the plea considered in the notice of Dr. Schmauk's article in these pages. He insists that the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper, the practice of immersion in Baptism, and the Congregational form of Church government are apostolic and hence permanent features of the Church. In considering the objection made to the claims of the Disciples that the Church of to-day ought to have grown beyond its infantile origin, ought to develop, the author holds that any evolution of the Church demands at the same time "an evolution beyond Christ Himself." By what law of logic this follows we fail to see. Surely our Lord Himself promised the Church the Holy Spirit to lead it into fuller and larger truth.

Dr. Mains, of the Methodist Church, argues that the united Church will come finally by way of "comprehension, not compromise." "Organic unity on the basis of denominational compromise is unthinkable. The whole of Christendom is wiser, and represents more fully the sum of truth, than is possible to any single denomination. All denominations, however small, have some demonstrable right for their existence. No one denomination, however historic or powerful, has the right to ask the lesser denomination to surrender or submerge its conviction. The working hypothesis for the unity of Christendom will finally be developed by the compelling power of great truths, which must appeal to the universal vision of the Christian world."

Dr. Garland, Bishop Suffragan of Pa., would not insist on the term *historic episcopate* but would prefer *historic ministry*, though he stands firmly on the teaching that it is through the episcopate that the continuity of his Church has been preserved. He insists, however, on the ministry as an "order" which the non-episcopal churches deny. In the beautiful scheme which he outlines for the unity of Christendom, he gives to each denomination a task of renunciation. "Accepting the fact of the historic ministry and desiring its perpetuation, the Lutheran Church

would have to substitute for its Reformation Confession, the simpler statement contained in the Creeds." In short, the mother of Protestantism in her self-abnegation is to sacrifice her simple Scriptural basis, around which the history of four centuries clusters, and which has needed no revision.

Principal Forsythe, of Hackney College, London, in a very able discussion of unity as related to Congregationalism takes the firm ground that Church polity must adapt itself to circumstances, but that the principle of liberty represented by Congregationalism must be preserved. The suggestion has been offered that if Anglicanism would recognize the element of freedom and energy in those Free Churches which accept the Atonement and the Incarnation, and if the Free Churches recognized the fundamental sacramentalism of the Church, a great step toward reunion would be taken. Concerning this Dr. Forsyth says that he does not see much hope till terms are more clearly defined. "I agree," says he, "that the free churches have not always done justice to the sacramental idea, that they have often lost it in the merely symbolic, not to say the merely memorial; that they have thought it to be exhausted in something shown instead of something done; and also that they have often lost the due sense of the essentially priestly nature of the Church as the active Body of the world's Great High Priest; and further that they have been known to treat the universal priesthood of believers as if it carried with it universal preaching and home-made theology. As a matter of fact, the priesthood of believers is much more their right to pray than to preach. Preaching is the prophetic function. But something more pointed than super-symbolism, something more physical, is involved in the sacramental claim, something which tends more to magic with the Elements than to might in the Act, and which severs the priest farther from the people than the mere order requires. It is something which moves the center of gravity in the word *Holy* Church from the ethical and experimental to the mysterious, the miraculous—from the conscience to the spiritual imagination." "The Word of Grace is always sacramental, whether it be by the eye or the ear, and its distinctive action gives us the prime nature of any sacrament. The one true central and congenial sacrament of Christ is the Word of the Gospel, whether in the deed we call speech or in the deed we call rite. The spoken word and the

vital act are collateral as sacraments of the Gospel." "The line here suggested rescues the Sacraments from Zwinglianism, makes them a real conveyance instead of a mere commemoration, a real act and not a mere symbol."

Dr. A. B. Leonard, of the Methodist Board of Foreign Missions, writes in the *Methodist Review* (Sept.) of "The Value of Prophecy and Miracle." Over against the attitude of liberal theologians, he maintains the old orthodox view that prophecy and miracle are valuable because "Our Lord Himself appealed to both these when His claim to the Messiahship was challenged." A recent writer claims that Christ never seemed anxious to fortify his teachings with miraculous wonders. "Then why so many miracles? Mark records in detail twenty-one, while in numerous instances he declares that many were healed of divers diseases and many devils and unclean spirits were cast out." Jesus Himself pointed to His miracles when John the Baptist sent messengers to ask whether He were the Christ. Nicodemus accepted Christ's miracles as a proof that God was with Him. "To eliminate prophecy and miracle is to place Jesus on the same human plane with many other teachers and philosophers without satisfactory proof of superiority. * * * To eliminate prophecy and miracles would be to take away two-thirds of His credentials and prestige, and rank Him with Buddha, Confucius, and Mohammed."

This is the way in which A. P. Fitch speaks of "The Preacher and the Creed," in *The Hartford Seminary Record*:

"No longer is a creed a fixed thing in American ecclesiastical life; no longer do we regard a creed as a past and present religious test, but rather as the testimony to the experiences of our forefathers. No longer do we repeat a creed as the standard of our present life but rather as an act of devotion in the same way in which we read or sing some hymns; not scrutinizing their theology but entering into their spirit. Any man who has intelligence and who has authority can say those things which are given to him to say, and say them without let or hindrance." To do this, it seems to us, savors more of hypocrisy than devotion. The Apostles' Creed has been a bulwark of the Christian faith, reminding tens of thousands of people of God, the Father,

the Son and the Spirit. It has emphasized the person and the work of our Lord in a few simple yet immortal words. The Church will not cease to cherish her creeds. They are not simply landmarks of her achievements in purity of doctrine, but the embodiment of her undying faith.

The Bible Champion (Aug.) quotes the following: "Recently four young men from Union Seminary were licensed to preach by the New York Presbytery, against the protests of some of its members. One of these young men is a son of Dr. Henry Van Dyke," who preached the ordination sermon in which he took his stand openly with the young men, endorsing "their refusal to believe the supernatural birth of Christ through the virgin and the miraculous resurrection of Lazarus," &c.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.

Scholars have long since recognized the influence of doctrine on life. Certainly there is a direct relation between the doctrine that a man holds and the life that he lives. The whole history of ethics teaches that fact. Psychology affirms a close connection between the belief and the choice. Hence doctrine, which is merely the formal expression of belief, vitally affects life as it is manifested in a series of choices. And vice versa.

In a general way this reciprocal relation between confession and culture has often been noticed and commented on by historians and theologians. Martensen in his Christian Ethics pointed out the cultural effect of the distinction between the two branches of the Protestant Church, the Lutheran and the Reformed. The Lutheran doctrine circling about the idea of justification by faith presents a more lively spirit of evangelical liberty and shows a greater faculty for the cultivation of the inner life. While the Reformed doctrine circling about the thought of God's sovereignty and carrying with it the idea of election to service has taken less time for introspection and has manifested more energy in acts of outward piety. The Lutheran Church accordingly has its strength in contemplation, in mysticism and theosophy, in hymnology, in worship and art. The Reformed Church has its strength in home and foreign missions, in voluntary associations for Christian objects, assistance to the

poor and sick, and the diffusion of the Scriptures and religious tracts.

But this general principle has never been traced sufficiently in detail. The lines of confessional influence upon ethics and culture have never been run through history in such a way as to show the exact contributions of the different theologies to the civilization of the present day. The past few years, however, have witnessed a growing disposition to make the ethical evaluation paramount in historical treatises and to trace the distinct cultural contributions of the different Churches as such. Under the influence of the historical method which seeks to analyze present-day civilization and to trace the development of its contributory elements, the endeavor is made to show how the varying doctrinal systems have variously moved men and nations and how they have contributed in different ways to the forces that have been operative through long periods directing the tendencies of peoples and developing their institutions and habits. Increasing effort is being applied to the work of estimating the varying relations of the theologies to the general advance of the human race, and this is one of the conspicuous tendencies of current thought among the historical disciplines.

As early as 1904 and 1905 Professor Max Weber of Heidelberg, in a series of penetrative and learned articles in the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* sought to show historically how the spirit of modern capitalism has grown out of the ethics of Calvinism. These articles attracted wide attention and gave much impetus to the philosophy of history in general. The most striking instance among modern theologians of the effort to weigh exactly the influence of doctrine upon civilization was Ernst Tröltzsch's discerning contribution (in 1906) to that comprehensive work, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*. Tröltzsch's article is entitled *Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit*, and would constitute a volume in itself. He shows among other things the concrete ethical effect of Lutheranism, Calvinism, Anglicanism, and Independentism. This was soon followed by *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt* (second edition 1911) from the same pen and with the same import. Both of these works were the inspiring causes of a large number of articles and books dealing with some aspect or other of Protestant ethics or seeking to trace

the historical development of some element or other in modern civilization, especially as it has been influenced by religious thought. Current thought is tending towards an historical method which rises above mere details of critical investigation and busies itself with the totality of history or the development of a given niveau, with the origin of social institutions and the growth of ideas in the religious sphere. The individual constituent elements of modern life are viewed in the perspective of the centuries. Many historical presentations are orientated from the point of view of the philosophy of history. History is chiefly useful because it leads to an understanding of the present. This has come to be realized very clearly in the last few years and hence many historians are now busying themselves with serious efforts to restore the unity of the human soul by gathering up the broken fragments of over-specialized scholarship and constructing them into a clear analysis of the modern world of thought and action. The strongest proof during the past year that this is the tendency, especially in theological thought, is the large work of more than a thousand pages by Trötsch entitled *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*. On the alert for steps in the growth of ideas Trötsch reviews the entire history of Christianity and points out in detail the attitude of the different Churches towards various social problems and the varying influence of the Churches upon society.

We shall be in a better position to appreciate Trötsch's views in his last and largest work if we first pass in review a more popular treatment of a similar theme as it was presented to the readers of *Die Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* in a series of articles this year by Dr. Hans Preuss of Leipzig, under the general topic, *Lutherische und Reformierte Frömmigkeit*. These articles, six in number, are simply another evidence of the current tendency to strike a balance and to estimate the comparative cultural influence of the different systems of faith and worship. Preuss' treatment is necessarily very brief, but it suggests a great many lines that ought to be pursued in detail. He contrasts Lutheranism and Calvinism, not as systems of theology but as concrete forms of religion. He sets forth in outline their fundamentally different attitudes towards ecclesiastical life as expressed in constitution, discipline, and forms of worship, in works of charity and in missionary en-

terprises, in their relations to the state and to the political economics, and in their respective attitudes to nature, to music, and to art.

This comparison can not fail to be of interest to the Lutherans of America where the Reformed Churches so completely overshadow the Lutheran, at least in numbers, and help to determine so largely our type of civilization. The rank and file of membership in the Lutheran Church as in the Reformed Churches are disposed to see no greater difference between the two than a slight difference of phraseology in forms of worship, the one using "Vater Unser" instead of "Unser Vater," "trespasses" instead of "debts," "hell" instead of "hades," and "Christian" instead of "catholic." The average Church member may know also that there is an important difference on the question of the Lord's Supper, though he may be unable to define that difference. The theologians usually add that there is an essential distinction between the two Churches in their views on predestination, Christology, and Church polity. But for the historian all these distinctions are but a few of the separate items which indicate a difference that is fundamental and organic. They may all be traced ultimately to a difference in religious type. The difference in confession constitutes a difference in pulse which indicates a difference in temperament and usefulness.

The most fundamental distinction between the Lutheran and the Calvinistic form of religion lies in their different conceptions of God's relation to the world. All variations in detail can be traced to this variation at the center of the two systems. Lutheranism emphasizes God's immanence in the world, His omnipotent love, while Calvinism emphasizes God's transcendence and majesty. This fact and its consequence Preuss sets forth in his first article. Calvin's Institutes are constantly referring to the *maiestas dei*. The correlate of majesty is wrath. Genuine religion is therefore closely connected with an earnest fear of God and the greatest sin in life is to fail to glorify the God of majesty. This absolute majesty demands implicit obedience and unceasing service and calls upon His devotees to make all worldly power and glory subject to His ineffable personality. Luther's view of God, on the other hand, is that He is a Father who is always near and full of love, who creates and who sustains. Lu-

ther did not indeed lose sight of God's transcendence, but he strongly emphasized His immanence. God's omnipresence is a favorite theme with him. Nothing in all creation can be closer or more familiar to us than God Himself with His power. He constrains His creatures not by fear but by love, even the love of children for their heavenly Father.

This difference in emphasis upon the divine attributes entails also a difference in attitude towards the world. The view of the Creator determines largely the view of creation. The Calvinist feels that the world must be made God's, and to that end he feels impelled to conquer the world and subdue it. Calvinism is therefore constantly active and aggressive, filled with a zeal for conquest of evil. But for the Lutheran the world is already God's and the creation sanctified through Christ is the delight of the soul. The joys of the world the Lutheran accepts as good gifts bestowed of God's hand; in the pains of life he is not without comfort for he feels that everything takes place according to God's good will. Lutheranism is therefore chiefly passive and its piety deeply inward. Lutheranism is a thoroughly religious movement, whereas Calvinism is more ethical.

From this underlying difference in philosophic presupposition follow all the individual items of difference in the two forms of religion. The severe theological conflicts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries might have ended far more quickly or might have been avoided entirely if instead of wrangling over individual "articles" or loci, which are only superficial symptoms, men had devoted themselves to the essential elements of their difference. It is always easier to reach an understanding upon essentials, even where there is essential disagreement, than upon accidents.

First let us look at several theological differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed growing out of their different conceptions of God and of the world. The difference in their views on predestination are quite fundamental. The Calvinistic doctrine is the beginning and end of Calvin's system. The Lutheran doctrine is merely auxiliary to the *sola gratia*. In the Calvinistic view of predestination the individual soul is necessarily left in uncertainty concerning his salvation and is forced to seek the assurance of his election in a round of good works. In the Lutheran view the Christian has the absolute assurance of his

salvation through the grace of God, and in His Christian assurance lies the religious significance of the Lutheran doctrine of predestination. This is the most important distinction between Calvinism and Lutheranism as forms of religion,—a difference as fundamental as that between the Roman Catholic form and the New Testament form.

In Christology the fundamental theological difference bears its fruit again. On the question concerning the mutual relations between the two natures of Christ's Person the Reformeds reject the *genus maiestaticum* because Calvinism refuses to mingle the merely human with the divinely majestic. They thus throw themselves open to the charge of Nestorianism. The Lutheran emphasis upon God's immanence in His world makes the union of the human and the divine quite an easy matter. It opens the way, however, for the charge of Monophysitism. This Christological difference in turn led to the well-known controversy concerning the Lord's Supper, which turned upon the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament. As applied to the means of grace in general the Calvinistic view of God and of Christ's Person involves an undervaluing of those means. God's sovereign majesty cannot be bound to the Word and the sacraments as the only means of grace. Thus is sundered the historical connection between the divine revelation in Christ and the conversion of the individual soul, and the way is opened for all forms of subjectivism, sectarianism, and radicalism.

As applied to Church life the imperial element in the Calvinistic conception of God manifested itself in a legalistic application of the letter of the Bible. Lutheranism also had the theory of verbal inspiration but Calvinism alone made the full practical application of the theory and thus imparted to the life of the Church an Old Testament character of strict law. This showed itself first of all in the constitution of the Reformed Church. With Luther the organization and polity of the Church are mere side issues to be determined in each case by practical considerations. But with Calvin questions of organization are vital questions of faith. The primitive ecclesiastical organization, reflected in the Pauline epistles, is a matter of divine revelation and therefore divinely commanded. And Calvin's legal training and his ability as organizer have become the heritages of his Church and they are important elements in her strength. For in the

Calvinist's effort to conquer the world for the God of majesty his Church polity constitutes a strong sword, whereas the history of Lutheran polity has been the history of a purely religious movement, deeply inward, passive and suffering.

Church discipline is very strict in genuine Calvinism. Obedience is the prince of virtues and almost any means are to be resorted to in order to enforce the letter of the law. Calvin and his followers have not hesitated to use excommunication, torture, sword, drowning and burning. Calvin was an Old Testament figure in his severe regulation of the morals of his community, and the Geneva of his day became a veritable convent where fear was the primal motive for conduct and where Christian espionage and Protestant inquisition prevailed. The result of this was that Geneva was almost free of outward immorality and in this respect shows a remarkable contrast to Lutheran Wittenberg, where so much immorality prevailed that Luther threatened to leave it in his old age.

The difference between the two forms of religion in their service of worship grows out of the fact that the Reformed have regarded the simplicity of the primitive Christian cultus as mandatory while the Lutherans have not hesitated to take the Roman liturgy, cleanse it and adapt it to their own worship, because they have felt that "the earth is the Lord's" and everything therein may be employed in the service of God.

In works of charity and benevolence the Reformed form of religion has manifested a superior practical sense. Calvin placed the ministry of love along side of the ministry of the Word and the ministry of discipline. Calvinism was largely responsible for the growth of pietism on Lutheran soil. The facts in the life of Spener and Francke indicate strong Calvinistic influence. The whole pietistic movement partook of the genius of Calvinism rather than of Lutheranism, as witness its practical trend, its desire for conquest, its disciplinary element, its strict supervision of morals, its enthusiasm, and its legal exactitude. The narrowness of this movement was overcome and its wholesome element conserved and translated into thoroughly Lutheran terms in the Inner Mission of the nineteenth century. Wichern, Löhe, and Bodelschwing were thoroughly imbued with Lutheran views of life and this spirit permeated their institutions.

In the foreign missionary enterprise the Reformed naturally

preceded the Lutherans. The impulse of their form of religion to conquer the world for the glory of God early led them to seek converts, first among Christians of Lutheran lands and then among the heathen abroad. The history of foreign missions is largely the history of Calvinistic organization for conquest.

In their attitudes towards the State there is also a fundamental difference. Lutheranism has always been passive and without political ambitions. The force of circumstances led the Lutheran Church to convey all her rights of government to the Christian State. But Calvinism seeks either to rule the State or else to be entirely free. Unlike the Lutherans the Calvinists have been skilled in the arts of politics, both secular and ecclesiastical. The polemics of the Lutherans has been earnest and often coarse, but always open and frank. But the Reformeds have been wise as serpents. They have made their disguised efforts at union, and Church History has its instances of Crypto-Calvinism, never of Crypto-Lutheranism. The political skill and statecraft of Calvinism has always manifested the suave cleverness of its French ancestry. Serpents glide but doves fly.

It is interesting to note also how differently the two confessions have influenced industrial life. Calvin's laws for Geneva touched such details as affected the health and cleanliness of the community, its linen and silk factories, and even its heating systems. It can hardly be regarded as an accident that the practical Anglo-Saxons have become Calvinistic and that the land of poets and thinkers has always been Lutheran. Max Weber's theory concerning the origin of modern capitalism, reproduced by Trötsch in his *Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt*, holds that the Calvinist in order to gain assurance of his election is driven to a life of ceaseless labor, not that he may enjoy the fruits of his labors but for labor's own sake. This kind of labor and self-denying economy, when stripped of its religious motivation, led directly to modern high finance. This theory misses several important factors in the development of modern capitalism, but it certainly is a remarkable fact that the lands where Calvin's influence predominates have always had the lead in matters of finance. Luther condemned the taking of interest, while Calvin once more showed his relation in spirit to the people of the Old Testament by sanctioning the practice of

usury. Tröltzsch has rightly observed that Lutheranism never bore any impulse whatever to strong industrial development. Capitalism and high finance have been very slow to develop in the land of Luther and this is grounded in Luther's fundamental view of the world.

When we turn from the political and industrial influence of the two confessions and direct our attention to such an institution as marriage, Lutheranism easily has the advantage over its sister confession, for this is a matter of the heart. In Calvin's conception marriage was based upon respect, in Luther's upon love. The home life of the two men showed the effect. Calvin like Luther, compared God's relation with his Church to the marriage relation but the points of comparison in Calvin's mind were chastity and jealousy, in Luther's mind a deep sense of love. Luther could never have been guilty of having a child beheaded for a trivial offense or of employing children as spies against their parents.

Nowhere is the fundamental difference between the two forms of religion so clear as in the realm of art. Art is the quickening of the natural, and in her kindly attitude towards nature as filled with God's presence the Lutheran Church towers high above the Calvinistic. Luther bequeathed to his Church an abounding joy over the works of nature. Calvinism and pietism rejected the pleasures of life, forbade the adiaphora, and indulged in a sort of asceticism, but the psychology of the Germans and the philosophy of the Lutherans made them a happy race, full of joy and sociability. This because of their attitude towards the world of nature.

It is not a matter for surprise therefore that this lyric appreciation of the joys of living and this fine feeling for the language of nature with its rich treasures of metaphor should have led to a copious hymnology among the Lutherans. For centuries the Reformed Churches made no progress beyond the paraphrases of the Psalms and produced only a few hymn-writers even of second magnitude, whereas the Lutheran Church produced a long line of brilliant stars who brought forth a hymnology that possesses genuine religious merit and is filled with a deep spirit of worship and devotion. And the great masters of German verse have all sprung from Lutheran soil; Klopstock, Lessing, Herder, Schiller, and Goethe.

When we come to art in the narrower sense, that of painting, we find the two forms of religion once more quite opposite in their tendencies. Calvin forbade all representations of God and all pictures in the churches. This he did basing upon a literal interpretation of the second commandment and fearing lest representations of God might be derogatory to His majesty and lest pictures in the churches might divert the mind from God's holiness. Even crucifixes are rejected as superfluous. Calvinistic art always remained upon the low level of realism. Luther, on the other hand, warmly welcomed Biblical pictures as religious auxiliaries. He did not believe that the arts ought to be forfeited for the sake of the Gospel but that all of the arts ought to be brought into the service of Him who made them. Luther emphasized the pedagogical rather than the aesthetic value of art. And Lutheran artists helped in no small measure to give expression to the work of the great Reformer.

But the most complete expression among the fine arts of Luther's work in the sphere of religion is Johann Sebastian Bach in the realm of music. The center of Bach's music like the center of Luther's religion, is the passion of the Crucified. Both the reformer and the musical master abound in impressive repetitions and boundless forms of expression. Both of them give touching expression to their appreciation of home-life. And both of them manifest a fine sense of complete harmony with God's glorious nature. The Reformed counterpart of Bach is Händel. His masterpiece was produced in the land of Calvinists and his music strongly reminds us of Calvin, especially in its quality of majesty. The frequent martial strains summoning to battle against the enemies of God are quite Calvinistic in their conception. Händel manifests also a strong predilection for the Old Testament. His oratorios are built exclusively of Old Testament materials and the Messiah, the only one of Christian theme, bears the Old Testament name of the Redeemer and the text is made up almost entirely of words from the Old Testament. Thus do the two forms of religion leave a different impress in the sphere of church music.

In this brief outline of the varying influence of the two confessions in the various spheres of activity reference was had primarily to Lutheranism and Calvinism in their genuine forms. But it is a well-known fact that they do not always exist in pure

and genuine forms. In fact the majority of Protestant Christians are to be found neither among the Lutherans nor in the purely Calvinistic camp but among the sects, whose combined membership is much larger than that of both Lutherans and pure Calvinists. Yet for purposes of historical evaluation the sects may easily be grouped under the head of Calvinism, not only because of their historical antecedents, but also because each one of them represents in exaggerated form some one aspect of Calvin's system and temper. The Baptists learned from Calvin to undervalue the objectivity of the sacrament. The Quakers learned from Calvin to deny the necessity of any means of grace. The Methodists received from the same source their strict discipline and their desire for conversion. From the same source the Adventists got their Old Testament legalism, the Salvation Army their military and world-conquering qualities, and the Irvingites their ascetic element. The Calvinistic doctrine of predestination has always had a tendency to separate and isolate and it is this lack of vital connection with the past that has brought forth so many denominations from Calvinistic theology. Lutheranism, on the other hand, though impolitic, unsophisticated, and unskilled in organization, has nevertheless always constituted a closed quantum, not indeed without its separate bodies, but always without its sects.

In a closing article Dr. Preuss points out the respective relations of Lutheranism and Calvinism as forms of religion to Roman Catholic piety. There are two streams in historical Catholicism. The one, coupled with the name of Francis of Assisi, consists of a poetic, inward contemplation of God. The other, associated with Ignatius Loyola, is moved with the impulse to conquest. Now Lutheranism is the evangelical continuation of Franciscan and Dominican mysticism, while Calvinism is the Protestant parallel of the Jesuit order. These parallels may be followed into the most remarkable details.

Each of the two confessions carries a danger within its system. Calvinism tends to over-emphasize the transcendence of God, and Deism has been the prime philosophic error of Calvinistic England. Lutheranism tends to over-emphasize the immanence of God, and Pantheism has been the prime philosophic error of Lutheran Germany.

A union of the two branches of Protestantism is not to be de-

sired. It is a mistake to suppose that the power and permanence of Protestantism depend upon its centralization. On the contrary, a large measure of the inner life and energy of Protestantism has grown out of its very lack of outer unity. Especially from the point of view of Lutheranism is such a union undesirable. For in *religious* values Lutheranism is easily superior to Calvinism. Lutheranism has created, Calvinism has copied and completed. And there is every reason to believe that if Lutheranism does not completely neglect the sphere of action, the world will long continue to reap her greatest benefit and blessing from this form of religion.

Space fails us to outline also Trötsch's views on this subject as set forth in his *Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

A System of Christian Evidence. A compend and guide for College and Seminary Instruction. By Leander S. Keyser, Professor in Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio. Published by the Author. Paper. Pp. v. 38. Price 25 cents.

This outline or syllabus of Christian Evidence covers the general principles of apologetics, and treats the subject from the biblical viewpoint affirming the integrity of the Bible as a revelation from God, defending the Christian theistic view of the world and showing the error of anti-theistic theories. It contains also numerous practical suggestions concerning the failure of infidelity, and the difficulties of doubters.

In the hands of a versatile teacher like Dr. Keyser, this outline will be both interesting, instructive and we hope convincing. It is full of good suggestions which any teacher will welcome.

Whether his system is the best possible may be open to question. Dr. Bruce would ignore some of the points offered by Dr. Keyser. Apologetics is a discipline that must adopt itself to the ever shifting attacks of unbelievers. Therefore no treatise can be of permanent value. Moreover it is sometimes urged that mere argument never convinces an unbeliever, and that therefore apologetics is of no use. But on the other hand it may be said that the unbeliever can probably be silenced and the believer confirmed in his faith.

Whatever criticism may be offered, Dr. Keyser has stated fundamental truths which all students ought to know.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

PUBLICATION BOARD OF THE REFORMED CHURCH. PHILA., PA.

The Identity of Christ. By Hiram King, D.D. Paper. Pp. 19.

Dr. King in his "Identity of Christ" seeks to establish the divinity of Christ and to demonstrate the lamentable failure of the Socinians from the sixteenth century on to identify him correctly. He shows from the sacred Scriptures that Christ existed before his birth in the flesh, that he is called the Creator, the universal Sovereign, the Divine Son on equality with God, that he is Deity accepting divine worship.

Dr. King has strongly stated the simple, incontrovertible scriptural argument that Christ is God. No Socinian ought to ignore the proofs found in the Bible. Alas! they allow poor short-sighted reason, which staggers at the supernatural, to deprive them of the truth and of its comfort that Jesus Christ is Lord and God incarnate.

Dr. King's pamphlet ought to be placed in the hands of sincere doubters.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

EATON AND MAINS. NEW YORK.

Christian Science So-called. An exposition and estimate. By Henry C. Sheldon, Professor in Boston University. Cloth. Pp. 102. Price 50 cts. net

In this brief essay Dr. Sheldon in his calm and yet incisive manner completely demolishes the pretensions and vagaries of Christian Science, one of the giant delusions of the present day. The statements of fact are from reliable sources, the principal ones being Georgine Milnes' "Life of Mary Baker G. Eddy" and Mrs. Eddy's own works.

A brief biographical sketch prefaces the discussion. The bare facts are stated that she was married three times, divorced once, had exceedingly limited educational advantages, suffered much in childhood and also later from an abnormal nervous condition, and was influenced by mesmerism and spiritualism. This is the background of her life when in 1862, at the age of forty-one, she became acquainted with P. P. Quimby of Portland, Maine, who really is the source of her teaching.

Three points comprise the discussion: (1) The claims of Mrs. Eddy for herself and her system; (2) facts with a moral import which bear upon the merits of the claims; (3) the claims as they appear from a rational point of view.

Mrs. Eddy claims that she is setting forth an original and fundamental philosophy of God and man, depending upon no one that preceded her except Christ and the biblical writers. She asserts that she is divinely inspired not only to interpret the Scriptures but to add to them. She says, "No human pen or tongue taught me the science contained in this book, Science and Health; and neither tongue nor pen can overthrow it." She claims greater infallibility than the pope. She blasphemously identifies the Holy Ghost with her "Divine Science." All outside Christian Science is "unstable error." She discredits the senses and denies the existence of matter. The whole circle of sciences as ordinarily understood has no existence.

In examining the moral import of her claims it will be found,

first of all, that she is guilty of the most shameless mendacity in repudiating her obligations to Quimby, from whose manuscript she practically purloined her whole system. This is proved beyond all possibility of denial, even by Mrs. Eddy's attempt to induce a Mrs. Crosby to perjure herself to sustain her claims. Another view of Mrs. Eddy shows her capable of the most violent hatred of those who failed to agree with her, accusing them of the most diabolical and at the same time absurd mental crimes.

Mrs. Eddy brooked no rival and asserted the most exclusive despotic supremacy. She made and unmade laws. She enthroned herself at the center of the Mother Church in Boston. "She judges all and is judged by none." She demanded instant and abject obedience. Her books are the final and complete authority and guide.

Mrs. Eddy's life bears the stamp of remorseless greed. Her price for seven lessons was \$300 for each pupil. A single hour would bring her two thousand dollars from a class of fifty. She accumulated a vast fortune, of which there is no record that any considerable part was ever devoted to charity. It is a fair conclusion that her purpose was to use her fortune for the perpetuation of a scheme of virtual self-deification. It is shocking to realize that this woman actually succeeded in usurping in her temples and in the minds of her deluded followers a place, as respects the authority of her teaching, alongside of Jesus Christ.

In the third place let us look at Mrs. Eddy's claims on rational grounds. Fundamentally she stands upon the sinking sands of Idealistic Pantheism. She unconsciously and ignorantly imbibed and repeated some of ancient and exploded philosophies. There is no matter; there is no sin and no disease. These things are the creations of a diseased imagination. God is the one Soul and man a selfless shadow, without personality. "Sin is nothingness and the sinner is nothingness, yet we are told that sin created the sinner. What is this but an absurd bandying about of terms, an utterly fantastic skipping back and forth between something and nothing?" Her attempts at metaphysical statement are a curious tangle of negation and contradiction.

As a scheme of healing Christian Science is a lamentable failure. Mrs. Eddy herself was a prey of delusions and baleful obsessions. Moreover so many exceptions are allowed in the matter of treating disease as to practically vitiate the entire claim. Surgery is permitted. Medical doctors are to be called to diagnose obstinate cases and contagious diseases are not to be treated. But how can undoubted cures by Christian Science be explained? The answer must be that they are accounted for by the influence of the mind on the body, exactly like the cures wrought by quacks and by the faith of Romanists at the shrines of the saints. The healing art of Christian Science is not only exceedingly limited,

but fraught with mischief, involving untold misery and often death.

I wish that this little book of Dr. Sheldon's might be placed in the hands of every votary of this preposterous delusion, miscalled Christian Science. The thinking adherents would have an eye-opener. Pastors ought to have a copy at hand to be loaned to those who are being led away from the flock by the promise of a fool's paradise on earth where sin and sickness are unknown.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Wheel-Chair Philosophy. By John Leonard Cole. With an Introduction by William Valentine Kelly. 12 mo. Pp. xii, 154. Cloth binding, gold top. Price 75 cts. net.

This is an intimate life story, intended, and well calculated, to carry comfort and hope to the afflicted. The author is a young Methodist minister who met with an accident during his last seminary vacation, that sent him to the hospital, with small hope of life, and none at all of ever being more than a helpless cripple, even if he survived the injury and shock.

But at last after long months of suffering and helplessness, he recovered far enough to go about in a "wheel-chair," and from this comes the title of the book. Still later he became able to walk, and finally to complete the seminary course and to enter the active ministry. It is pleasant to note that he attributes the "miracle" of his recovery to the prayers of his faithful friends, and especially of his pious and devoted mother.

The book is made up of the story of his experiences during his period of disability, told in a most intimate and fascinating way, and observations and reflections suggested by what he saw and felt during that time. No "shut-in" could possibly read the book, nor any well person, for that matter, without deep interest and great profit.

JACOB A. CLUTZ

Plain Thoughts on Faith and Life. By Wellesley P. Coddington. 12 mo. Pp. 225. Bound in cloth, with gilt top. Price \$1.00 net.

The author of this book has had a long and varied experience as a student and teacher. Since 1871 he has been connected with Syracuse University, serving in turn as Professor of Greek and Ethics, Professor of Philosophy and Pedagogy, and for some years now as Professor of Philosophy.

He has thus come to the task of writing these "Plain Thoughts on Faith and Life," with a mind cultured and trained by study, and richly stored with beautiful and stimulating thought. He discusses, in a very attractive manner and style, such subjects as

"The Abiding Life," "The Impregnable Foundation," "A Positive Faith," "A Glance Through the Open Door," "Our Unconscious Faults," &c.

JACOB A. CLUTZ

The Life Efficient. By George A. Miller. 12 mo. Pp. viii, 248. Cloth binding, gold top. Price \$1.00 net.

This book takes its title from the first chapter. Yet the idea of efficiency runs all through the twenty chapters of which it is composed. Among the other titles of chapters are, "The Life that is Strong," "The Fountain of Faith," "The Gospel of the Commonplace," "Have Faith in God," &c.

Very few of the chapters have texts prefixed, yet they all have more or less of the sermonic form, and the suspicion is awakened that they were first preached before being printed. If so, they were good sermons. There is a freshness and virility of thought and style about them that make them very attractive and forceful reading. If they were preached they must have been interesting and stimulating to listen to. They deal with the real and vital things of life in a realistic and vital way.

The following extract, taken from the chapter on "The Gospel of the Commonplace" is interesting just at this time, and especially so as coming from a Methodist. Moreover it is as true as it is interesting. "We cling to the vast union tabernacle meeting with its crowds and its enthusiasm, but after the smoke has cleared away, the permanent results are mainly the effect of the quiet steady work that has gone on through the years. If you want to find the living God, don't run off after the occasional shouter, but go to your own church, attend the prayer meeting, and find there Him whom you have sought in vain because you were looking in the wrong place. If you sincerely desire a work of grace in the church, let every official member, and all the others too, come to the prayer meeting and the Sunday School and the Sunday evening service, and the results will outstrip those attained by the whirlwind method."

JACOB A. CLUTZ

The Men of the Gospels. By Lynn Harold Hough. 16 mo. (4 1-2 x 6 3-4 in.) Pp. 98. Price 50 cts. net.

This is the fourth volume to come from the pen of the gifted pastor of Mt. Vernon Place M. E. Church of Baltimore, Md. Like the other three it is evidently the work of a strong and vigorous thinker, who knows how to clothe his thoughts in good and forceful English. Twelve of the "Men of the Gospels" are selected for discussion in as many brief chapters. Among them are John the Baptist, Peter, Nicodemus, Pilate, &c., and finally Jesus himself as "*The Man of the Gospels.*"

Necessarily, the discussions are brief, etchings rather than finished portraits, but the work is done with a strong and skillful hand, and the lineaments are clearly drawn and true to life. If the chapters of this little book are not condensed sermons, they could easily be expanded into sermons that would make the best kind of biographical preaching.

JACOB A. CLUTZ

THE BIBLE INSTITUTE COLPORTAGE ASSOCIATION. CHICAGO. 826
LA SALLE AVE.

How to Prepare Sermons and Gospel Addresses. By Rev. William Evans, D.D. 12 mo. Pp. 178. Price \$1.00 net. By mail 8 cts. additional for postage.

The author of this new book on "Sermon-Making" is the Director of the Bible Course in the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago. He follows in general the path marked out by some of the older writers on Homiletics, especially Broadus who is frequently quoted. Yet the volume is not without originality in the treatment of the subject.

Special features are the recognition of the value and importance of what are called "Gospel Addresses," or Lay Preaching, and the addition of a Second Part, covering some thirty pages, containing a large number of illustrative outlines of Textual and Expository Sermons, and Bible Readings, &c.

Another excellent feature of the book is the strong emphasis placed all through on the necessity of earnest piety and deep spirituality in the preacher if he is to be a true minister of Jesus Christ and a winner of souls. We gladly commend this volume both to ministers and lay-workers for reading and study.

JACOB A. CLUTZ

WARTBURG PUBLISHING HOUSE. CHICAGO.

Christology or the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Outline Notes Based on Luthardt. By Revere Franklin Weidner, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in the Chicago Lutheran Seminary. Cloth. Pp. 222. Price \$1.00 net.

Dr. Weidner's *Christology* is a compend of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ "as revealed in the New Testament, confessed by the Christian Church, and as taught especially by the mother of all Protestant Churches, the rapidly increasing and conservative Lutheran Church." The plan of the work is first to state the doctrine and its Scripture proof, then to trace its historical development, and finally to defend it against modern perversions.

This comprehensive treatment must necessarily be suggestive rather than exhaustive. Hence, the book fairly bristles with points. As the book appears in print its contents seem somewhat too condensed. In the class-room the elaboration of the teacher will no doubt remedy this. As a book of ready reference Dr. Weidner's Christology will be welcomed not only by the student, but by the pastor.

I would take exception to the author's exposition of Hades. He says, (p. 147) "This invisible world into which all souls went at death, *before* Christ's resurrection is known in Scripture as Hades. It embraced two parts, the place or state of bliss, and the lower part the place or state of misery. Its generic name is Hades, and the soul going into either part would be in Hades." Dr. Weidner has fallen into the not uncommon error of reading into the Scriptures the heathen or Jewish ideas of the underworld. As a fact the word Hades is never used in a good sense in the New Testament. It refers only to the grave, to oblivion, or to hell. A careful collation of the passages conclusively shows this.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN, 150 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK.

A One-sided Autobiography. By Oscar Kuhns. Pp. 236. Price \$1.00 net.

Mr. Zangwill says of a certain writer that he has "concealed himself behind his autobiography." This Doctor Oscar Kuhns has not succeeded in doing, even though he has described his book as "one-sided." He is known to many of us as the Professor of Romance Languages at the Wesleyan University, a writer of authority upon Dante, and as the author of a valuable work on "The German and Swiss settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania," we discover him now to be a delightful person whose knowledge is not limited to Romance Languages or to the history of his Pennsylvania German ancestors, but one who has a wide acquaintance with the literature of the ages.

Doctor Kuhns' passion for reading has been a consuming fire, he gives here with inspiring enthusiasm an account of his love for books. His enthusiasm is imparted to us, we realize as we read that here is a happiness which all of us might have. He has read for pure enjoyment, he recounts with due gratitude the stories over which he poured in his youth. He gives an account also of his reading as a scholar, of his deep joy in tracing in the principles of growth and development discoverable in the history of the earth and its inhabitants. He read finally for spiritual uplifting and his books have helped him to rise "with all the energy of his soul to a belief in God and a happier life beyond."

The "One-sided" Autobiography is a book to be recommended to those fortunate young people who have a fondness for books. Perhaps, indeed, it may inspire in those who are not so blessed a curiosity to investigate the path which has led to such great satisfaction. It is not a book to be borrowed and lightly read, but a book to be acquired permanently to serve as a companion

E. S. L.

NORTHWESTERN PUBLICATION HOUSE. MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Pastorale Praxis, in der Ev. Luth. Freikirche Amerikas, von J. Schaller, Professor and theologischen Seminar zu Wauwabosa, Wis. Cloth. Pp. x, 142.

This excellent treatise concerning the attitude and the acts of the Christian pastor of an American Lutheran Church covers practically the entire field of pastoral activity. It should be in the hands of all young pastors who read German, and it ought to be translated into English. The author states simply, clearly and comprehensively just such things as the young pastor ought to know. If this work could be translated and perhaps edited by an American English Lutheran pastor of experience its usefulness would be multiplied.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

Union with Christ, A Chapter of Systematic Theology. By Augustus H. Strong, D.D., Pres. Emeritus of the Rochester Theological Seminary. Cloth. Pp. 84.

This book is a reprint of a chapter from Dr Strong's Systematic Theology. It contains much that is beautiful and true concerning the intimate relation between Christ and his people.

It seems to us that he is in error in making union with Christ to precede regeneration and conversion. This can be true only in a forensic sense. Union follows or accompanies the acceptance of Christ in faith. Concerning alleged erroneous views of the mystical union, Dr. Strong classes the Lutherans with Romanists, and High Church Episcopalians who hold that this union is "mediated and conditioned by participation of the sacraments of the Church," and who look upon it "as a physical and material one." He adds, "It is sufficient here to say that this union cannot be mediated by sacraments, since sacraments presuppose it as already existing."

These statements are full of errors. The Lutherans do not believe that the union is mediated alone by the sacraments. They

hold that word and sacrament are co-ordinate, working together. They absolutely deny a physical union with Christ. Dr. Strong's false views of baptism lead him into the error concerning the whole matter of the application of redemption.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

Conversion and Election. A Plea for a United Lutheranism in America. By F. Pieper, D.D. Paper. Pp. 151.

This little book contains a discussion called forth by the union of several Norwegian Synods. It reviews the Norwegian Articles of Agreement from the standpoint of "Missouri." The learned author claims in reference to the truth concerning "grace," that the true Scriptural view, which maintains both *sola gratia* and *universalis gratia* has been expressed only three times in public documents issued by churches: in the decree of the Synod of Orange in A. D. 529; in the Eleventh Article of the Form of Concord in 1580; and in the 13 Theses of the Missouri Synod, in 1881.

The author expresses the hope that the Norwegians may fully accept the Form of Concord, and after this that all other Lutherans may follow their example.

We fear that the brethren of the Missouri Synod have at times indulged in hair-splitting, which has led to unnecessary controversy. In controversy statements are frequently made which do not stand closer inspection. Then extremists arise on both sides whose exaggerations furnish fuel for further contention. Let us have peace, standing firmly upon the Word of God, and accepting our Confessions as a fair explication of the same. We feel convinced that no Lutheran body in America is Pelagian or semi-Pelagian. They all hold that salvation is purely of grace accepted by a faith which is itself the gift of God. Moreover, in accepting *sola gratia* they do not deny *gratia universalis*. Renouncing all merit of our own and relying solely upon the merit of Christ, why can we not see eye to eye in the Lutheran Church of America—probably the staunchest body of conservative Christians in the world?

J. A. SINGMASTER.



Books Which Every Lutheran Should Read

The Lutheran Monograph Series

A new series of timely booklets for popular reading at popular prices.

The Distinctive Doctrines of Lutheranism

By A. G. VOIGT, D. D.

Our doctrines are stated so clearly and simply that they can be grasped by every reader. It is a valuable contribution to the understanding of Lutheran doctrines.

Present Day Lutheranism

By F. P. MANHART, D. D.

Anyone who wishes to understand the actual situation in the Lutheran Church to-day as regards doctrine, polity and synodical organizations will find it all here in a nut shell.

Is the Ministry an Attractive Vocation?

By DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

A new edition of this stimulating booklet as a number of the Lutheran Monograph Series. It may now be secured at a great reduction in price.

The Miracles of Christ

By the late MILTON VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D.

This monograph is a reprint of Dr. Valentine's lucid and powerful discussion of the nature, the place, the proof and the evidential value of miracles in an argument for Christianity, which was contained in Volume I. of his "Christian Theology." Many who cannot possess the larger work will welcome this masterly extract.

Single copies, 5 cents; 50 cents a dozen, net.

The Nature of God

By JOHN A. HALL, D. D.

These chapters are given as the answer of Christian faith to the inquiry, "What is God?" They show the failure of philosophy adequately to answer that inquiry. The author insists upon the divine revelation of Scripture. Many illuminating paragraphs set forth the deep things sometimes hard to understand. One lays down the book with quickened pulses and ardent faith.

\$1.25 net, postpaid

The Post-Apostolic Age and Current Religious Problems

By J. B. REMENSNYDER, D. D., LL. D.

Modern progress has cleared up many things, but it has not shaken the central pillars of Christianity. The book contains a general discussion of the time succeeding the apostolic age, and the doctrines taught, and finds that primitive and modern Christianity are essentially the same.—*The Advance*.

The author has read many authorities on the subjects he discusses and his book abounds in valuable quotations. He writes in pleasing style, and the reader will receive many helpful suggestions from the comparison of the doctrines and usages of the time following the Apostles and those of the Protestant period. In this respect the work is unique, and an original contribution to modern apologetic literature.—G. W. Richards, D. D., in the *Reformed Church Review*.

\$1.25 net, postpaid

The Lutheran Catechist

By G. H. GERBERDING, D. D.

This volume has a legitimate place without crowding upon others, for the literature of catechesis in English is not extensive. Doctor Gerberding writes out of his experiences as a pastor for nearly twenty years and as a teacher of prospective preachers for nearly as long a period. The book has been prepared with scholarly thoroughness and with practical ends ever in view. It shows wide reading on the literature of the subject, and will confirm the Lutheran Church in the wisdom of its catechetical practices.—*The Lutheran Observer*.

\$1.50 net, postpaid

SEND US YOUR ORDER FOR ANY BOOK ON THE MARKET

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1424 Arch Street, Philadelphia

51

